



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

Daily Report

Soviet Union

**FBIS-SOV-88-037
Thursday
25 February 1988**

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-037

CONTENTS

25 February 1988

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Stand on Sea-Launched Missiles Criticized [Zhukov in PRAVDA 20 Feb]	1
Soviet Missiles Withdrawn From GDR, CSSR	2
Government Statement	2
GDR Withdrawal To Begin 25 Feb	2
Prompted by Berlin Meeting	3
TV Report on Dismantling	3
CSSR Pullout Starts 25 Feb	4
CSSR Spokesman on Withdrawal	4
NATO's 'Contradictory' Signals on Arms Race [Kalyagin]	4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov Holds News Conference 24 Feb	5
On Nagorno-Karabakh Events	5
On N. Europe NATO Forces	5
On Strengthening of UN Role	5
'Support' for Afghan Statement	5
Alliance of Seven 'Obstacle'	6
UK Military Exercises Scored	6
Balkan Foreign Ministers Meet in Belgrade	6
SFRY's Mojsov Opens Session	6
Foreign Ministers Speak	7
Turks Bypass U.S. Bases Issue	7
Romania's Totu Suggests Summit	8
'International Review' of Week's Events [Grigoryev in PRAVDA 21 Feb]	8
Briefs	11
Accord Against Air Terrorism	11

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Plans To Destroy Outdated Chemical Weapons	12
Reagan Comments at News Conference 24 Feb	12
On Shultz Trips, Contra Aid	12
On Middle East, Nicaragua	12
Reagan Speaks of Upcoming NATO Meeting	13
Shultz Reports to Reagan on Moscow Talks	13
Comparison of Shevardnadze-Shultz Talks	13
Bessmertnykh on Shultz Talks in Moscow	14
U.S. Media Coverage of Shultz Talks Assessed [IZVESTIYA 24 Feb]	15
Turkatenko Reports Shultz Departure for Mideast	16
Pogodin Views Shultz Middle East Tour	16
Vasilyev Comments on Shultz Middle East Visit	17
Arms Control Report Sent to Congress	17
Senate Continues Hearings on INF Treaty	18
Senator Byrd Speaks in Favor of INF Treaty	18
Portugal's Silva Discusses Airbases With Reagan	18
U.S., Israel Gain From 'Brain Drain' [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 14 Feb]	18
Briefs	19
Canadian Sports Cooperation	19

Near East & South Asia

Pakistan Criticized for Geneva Talks Stance	20
PRAVDA: Pakistan 'Torpedoing' Talks	20
Afghans Demand 'Realistic Stand'	21
Afghan Minister on Coalition	21
Feigned 'Concern' for Refugees [Vavilov]	21
Polyakov Discusses Recent Mideast Tour	22
U.S. Ideas 'Lack Consistency'	22
Describes Saudi Talks	23
Israel Intensifies Security for Shultz Visit	23
Roundtable Discussion on Palestinian 'Uprising' [Kuwait AL-ANBA]	24
Official Praises Ties With Kuwait, Riyadh [Kuwait KUNA]	24
Geology Minister Receives PDRY Envoy [Aden]	25

East Europe

Further on Gromyko Delegation in Budapest	25
Meets With Nemeth	25
Gromyko, Nemeth Dinner Speeches [PRAVDA 24 Feb]	26
Gromyko Meets Kadar, Grosz	30
Further on Meeting [PRAVDA 25 Feb]	31
Antonov, Voss News Conference	33

Latin America & Caribbean

CIA, Drug, Contra 'Criminal Network' Claimed [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Feb]	33
Nicaragua's Ortega on U.S. 'Humanitarian' Aid	35
Argentina, Columbia Condemn Falkland Maneuvers [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Feb]	35
Chilean Political Forces Comment on Plebiscite	36

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

More on Demonstrations in Nagorno-Karabakh	38
Obkom First Secretary Replaced [PRAVDA 25 Feb]	38
Pogosyan Biography	39
'Sweeping Demonstrations' [Yerevan]	39
'Complicated Political Situation' [Yerevan]	39
Dolgikh on 'Armenian Problem' [Yerevan]	40
More Demonstrations Reported [AFP]	40
Troops Deployed in Yerevan [AFP]	40
Armenians Killed in Karabakh [Hamburg DPA]	41
Correction to Moscow TV Report on Protests	41
More on Estonian Independence Day Demonstration	41
20,000 Reportedly Take Part [AFP]	41
Workers Protest U.S. Interference	41
Mayor on 'Improvised Meetings'	42
Archbishop on Protest Call	42
TASS Reports Closure of Industrial Ministry	43
Biryukova Tour of Chardzhou Oblast Described	43
Visits Enterprises [Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA 23 Jan]	43
Attends Turkmen Aktiv Meeting [Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA 24 Jan]	45
Turkmen Tour Ends [Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA 24 Jan]	46
Kapitonov Central Auditing Commission Speech [PRAVDA 19 Feb]	46
Monument To Be Erected to Chernobyl Heroes	47
Kiev Plants Hiring Out-of-Towners Face Tax [IZVESTIYA 13 Feb]	47
Philosopher Calls for Unfettered Public Debate [Goldin in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 16 Feb]	48
Reader Claims Legal Rights Exist Only in Press [SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 18 Feb]	52
TV Foreign Affairs Reporting Challenged [Tsvetov in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 16 Feb]	53

Director Discusses Theme of 'Repentance' [Abuladze in PRAVDA 13 Feb]	55
Burlatskiy on Khrushchev, Role in History [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 24 Feb]	55

Economic

January Industrial Performance Report [EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 8]	62
---	----

Scientific

Soviets To Launch Indian Satellite in March	66
---	----

Military

Kulikov Views Army Anniversary, Polish Ties [Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI 20-21 Feb]	67
Comments on Army History [Bratislava PRAVDA 23 Feb]	69
Chernavin on Anniversary, 'Defensive' Doctrine [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Feb]	71
Defense Ministry Releases Navy Documentary	73
Gareyev Addresses Briefing on Doctrine [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Feb]	75
Discusses Arctic, Vietnam	75
Further on Briefing	76
Civil Defense Chief on Tasks, Priorities [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 21 Feb]	76

U.S. Stand on Sea-Launched Missiles Criticized
PM231645 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Feb 88
Second Edition p 4

[PRAVDA political observer Yuriy Zhukov article: "On Land, in the Air... but at Sea?"—boldface as published]

[Text] In political and military circles in Europe—both West and East—opinions have repeatedly been aired in recent times on how the question of nuclear weapons on warships is to be resolved.

In early February, the British magazine *NEW STATESMAN* reported that U.S. General Galvin, NATO supreme allied commander Europe, is currently seeking the U.S. Congress approval for appropriations to create a "new nuclear arsenal" to "compensate (!) for the loss of firepower because of the treaty on intermediate-range nuclear forces." This plan, the *NEW STATESMAN* explained, particularly envisages placing several hundred **sea-launched cruise missiles** on ships concentrated near West European coasts.

It is impossible to ignore in this regard an article published on 2 February in the Swedish newspaper *DAGENS NYHETER* entitled "The Significance of Sea-Launched Nuclear Weapons Is Increasing." The article was based on the newspaper correspondent's conversations with a number of senior Norwegian and NATO military officials.

"We see a tendency toward switching cruise missiles to surface ships and submarines," V. Eide, Norwegian Armed Forces commander in chief, said. "The significance of sea-launched nuclear weapons will grow even if the number of missiles remains at the previous level. This will lead to the seas around Norway acquiring great strategic significance."

In this regard, it seems to me, it is time to clarify the question of how the problem of this variety of nuclear weapon, which is no less dangerous than all the others, will be resolved. I recall that our Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze, speaking at a Bonn news conference 19 January this year, stated that the question of naval arms deserves very serious, major discussion.

The entire world knows that the U.S. Administration is spending enormous resources on the development and improvement of naval forces, particularly on equipping them with nuclear missile weapons. Just recently the commissioning ceremony for the missile cruiser "San Jacinto," the 10th in its class, took place in Houston.

After this a new nuclear aircraft carrier, the "Abraham Lincoln," the fifth in its class, was launched on 13 February at Newport News. This ship, which was built at a cost of \$3.5 billion, will come into service in 1989. It will have a crew of 6,000 men. It will carry up to 80 combat aircraft armed with nuclear weapons. As U.S. Defense Secretary F. Carlucci stated frankly when he

addressed the ceremony, the completion of this aircraft carrier is part of the "deterrent strategy" (!) directed at safeguarding U.S. interests throughout the world.

The construction of powerful nuclear submarines to be armed with Trident-2 ballistic nuclear missiles is also continuing. In addition, the Pentagon is planning to create new types of nuclear submarines meant for delivering missile strikes against diverse ground-based targets. As Vice Admiral B. Demars, U.S. Navy deputy chief of staff, stated in an interview with UPI, variants are being tested which involve the transmission of information on "targets" to submarines from satellites with the aid of laser beams or by means of fiber optic cables laid on the ocean floor.

"Without being noticed, I could site an underwater 'weapons platform' right under the Russians' noses or, for example, on Libya's Mediterranean coast, threatening to deliver a nuclear strike at any moment (!)," the vice admiral noted.

It is natural that when the question of reducing strategic nuclear arms was discussed at the Washington summit, the question of sea-launched nuclear arms was not ignored.

In terms of submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMS), everything is more or less clear: Agreement has been reached that the treaty now being prepared in Geneva on a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms must provide for a corresponding count of nuclear warheads placed on these missiles, amounting in total to 6,000 units of nuclear charges.

As for long-range (more than 600 km) sea-launched cruise missiles, the U.S. side is still trying to leave them "in parentheses," although a very important point was written into in the joint Soviet-U.S. summit statement of 10 December in this context, the essence of which permits no misinterpretation: "**The parties will find a mutually acceptable solution on the question of limiting the deployment of long-range sea-launched cruise missiles equipped with nuclear weapons.**" They will find! But how should the search for this solution be organized at the talks, and in what direction should it go?

This would be a convenient point at which to recall what M.S. Gorbachev said on this question at his 10 December news conference in Washington. Noting that there had been "developments" on the problem of limiting the deployment of long-range sea-launched cruise missiles, he said that the U.S. side had set a maximum level of over 6,000 charges for these missiles which, when the treaty on the 50-percent reduction of strategic arms is in operation, will remain on each side. (Consequently, it remains to be agreed how many long-range sea-launched cruise missiles each side will be allowed to have!)

Further, M.S. Gorbachev recalled, the U.S. side agreed to "seek mutually acceptable and effective methods for verifying the implementation of such limitations. There was a quite interesting exchange of views in this respect." What specifically are we talking about here?

As well-informed experts who took part in the talks say, the U.S. side, as is usually the case when it really does not want to agree to an accord on the reduction of arms, put forward the standard argument on the "impossibility" of verification.

"We would dearly have liked to agree to limit the number of these missiles," the U.S. experts assured them, "but how can it be monitored whether there are nuclear missiles on a given ship? They can be installed on any ship, moreover on any civilian ship, on a tanker—on any platform at sea. You cannot put inspectors on every vessel."

"Why on every one?" the Soviet side objected. "Our scientists have already developed national means capable of detecting the presence of nuclear weapons on any vessel—underwater or on the surface—without direct inspection on board."

"This is impossible," the U.S. experts said. "Your instrument, perhaps, will detect only the background radiation from the reactor which drives the ship, but how will it distinguish it from a nuclear missile?"

Here the Soviet side stumped these skeptics by suggesting, if the sides do come to an agreement, sharing our technical achievements in this sphere.

"We suggested sharing our achievements should we reach agreement," M.S. Gorbachev said at the news conference. "Let our partners be assured that these means provide the opportunity of determining by national means not only the existence but also the capacity of the charges. This problem—the problem of verification—was the most difficult obstacle in resolving the entire question of sea-launched cruise missiles."

Incidentally, in Washington the Soviet side suggested going even further in questions of organizing verification: creating a joint Soviet-U.S. commission of scientists which could express its thoughts and recommendations both to the U.S. Administration and to the Soviet leadership.

More than 2 months have passed since all these far-reaching initiatives were introduced. But reciprocal proposals have not been heard from Washington. It might be thought that they intend to shelve the entire problem of limiting long-range sea-launched cruise missiles.

But is it not clear that this question cannot be deferred? Does Washington really think that the Soviet Union will close its eyes to the fact that the United States, while

agreeing to halve the number of strategic arms of all launch modes, "will compensate" for this reduction with the deployment of long-range sea-launched cruise missiles?

I think they are already convinced that they will not find such simpletons in Moscow. Is it not time to undertake a serious search for a solution to this urgent problem? Is it not time to examine the question of the reduction of naval arms and naval activity on a broader scale? Especially as the activity of the U.S. Navy, as the recent intrusion of two U.S. naval ships into our territorial waters off the southern coast of the Crimea has shown, is assuming an increasingly dangerous thrust.

The corresponding Soviet proposals are at the U.S. Administration's disposal.

Soviet Missiles Withdrawn From GDR, CSSR

Government Statement

*LD242115 Moscow TASS in English 2112 GMT
24 Feb 88*

[Text] Moscow February 25 TASS—Follows the text of a Soviet Government statement:

The treaty between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, signed on December 8, 1987, provides also for the liquidation of Soviet OTR-22 (SS-12) missiles of shorter range which were deployed on the territory of the GDR and Czechoslovakia as reply measures to the deployment of American intermediate-range missiles in several West European countries.

Proceeding from an accord reached at a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty member states in Berlin in May 1987 the Soviet Government decided as a display of good will to withdraw the Soviet OTR-22 (SS-12) missiles, their launchers and corresponding auxiliary equipment from the territory of the GDR and Czechoslovakia on agreement with the governments of these countries already before the INF Treaty enters into force.

The missiles will be withdrawn in February-March 1988 to the territory of the USSR to places designated in the memorandum of accord on the establishment of initial data in connection with the said treaty.

GDR Withdrawal To Begin 25 Feb

*LD241150 Moscow TASS in English 1120 GMT
24 Feb 88*

[Text] Berlin February 24 TASS—The announced ahead-of-schedule withdrawal of Soviet shorter-range missiles from the German Democratic Republic will begin tomorrow in the areas of Waren and Bischofswerda, a spokesman for the GDR Foreign Ministry said today in a statement for ADN news agency.

He said the move is the latest evidence of the constructively peaceful policy of the Soviet Union, the GDR and other socialist nations.

An important practical contribution to the earliest ratification of the historic Soviet-American treaty of December 8, 1987, it should create favorable conditions for its fulfillment.

The withdrawal of these systems at such an early date, which has been agreed with the USSR, is directed also at strengthening East-West trust and stimulating further positive changes, first of all those in Europe.

It is expected in connection with this move that the other side as well will take steps to facilitate the treaty's early entry into space.

The statement said further that the GDR at one of the USSR and other Warsaw Treaty members has been acting in accordance with the principle: No pauses must now be allowed in the process of disarmament.

It is in keeping with this position of principle that Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and president of the State Council of the GDR, made a number of specific proposals, whose realization would have far-reaching significance to supporting the process of disarmament, in a letter to Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl of the Federal Republic of Germany way back on December 16, 1987.

Prompted by Berlin Meeting

*LD251426 Moscow TASS in English 1402 GMT
25 Feb 88*

[Text] Berlin February 25 TASS—People living in the small townships of Waren and Bischofswerda in the German Democratic Republic today witnessed a really historic event—the beginning of the withdrawal of Soviet shorter-range OTR-22 missiles from the German Democratic Republic.

The early removal of the missiles even before the Soviet-American INF Treaty's entry into force is being carried out in keeping with an understanding reached at last May's Berlin conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member nations and by agreement with the Government of the GDR.

It is further evidence of the socialist countries' serious and responsible approach to the task of fully abolishing nuclear weapons and strengthening security and trust among nations.

TV Report on Dismantling

*LD241724 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1530 GMT 24 Feb 88*

[Report by Vyacheslav Mostovoy, "new" correspondent to the GDR, from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Mostovoy] I am bringing my first reportage from a small town called Waren in the north of the republic. This geographical landmark has recently become especially popular among journalists from various countries of the world. Not far from here, a few minutes by road, is the deployment site of the Soviet short-range missiles.

The operational-tactical missiles began their period of combat duty here 4 years ago as a response to the deployment of the U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles in West Europe. But even then the Governments of the Soviet Union, the GDR, and Czechoslovakia stated clearly that the missiles would be withdrawn at the first opportunity.

Today this has become a reality as a result of the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. Today, even before the ratification of the Soviet-U.S. treaty, on our country's initiative the missiles are being withdrawn from the GDR.

When we reached the unit's location, the last missiles were being prepared for dispatch. Here they are, one after the other, being packed into containers. In 2-3 days special trains will deliver these menacing weapons to the Soviet Union, to the place of their final destruction.

Equipment is also being prepared for dispatch, and people are getting ready to leave. There are last meetings with friends, souvenir gifts for the little ones, and invitations to visit during the summer.

[Unidentified GDR military officer in German with superimposed Russian translation] I believe that this is a new and very important step by the Soviet Government and is yet further proof of the Soviet Union's love of peace and its commitment to withdraw the missiles from the GDR ahead of schedule. It is also reaffirmation of the fact that all points of the INF Treaty will definitely be fulfilled.

[Mostovoy] So these missiles have been placed in a horizontal position forever. The inscription on the launching pad has lost its topicality. This spring brings hope and confidence to the peoples of the planet. [video shows vehicle leaving with missile in horizontal position; inscription on launch pad reads: "Date of next test: 20.8.88."]

CSSR Pullout Starts 25 Feb

*LD251357 Moscow TASS in English 1347 GMT
25 Feb 88*

[Text] Hranice-on-the-Morava February 25 TASS—By TASS correspondent Valeriy Rzhnevskiy:

Soviet shorter-range missiles OTR-22's, their launchers and auxiliary equipment began to be loaded into rail cars at the station of this township in northern Moravia today.

The first train with them is to leave here tonight.

The missiles are being withdrawn in keeping with a decision of the Soviet Government and an understanding reached at last May's Berlin conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states.

By agreement with the Czechoslovak Government, the missiles are being removed even as the INF (Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force) Treaty is yet to go into force.

A farewell rally for Soviet missile personnel was attended by local residents and servicemen of the Czechoslovak People's Army. Speakers said the move by the Soviet Government is fresh evidence of the Soviet Union's good will and its desire to being about nuclear disarmament and create a secure world.

The missiles and launchers will be delivered in several days' time to sites where they are to be eliminated right after the Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty is ratified.

CSSR Spokesman on Withdrawal

*LD251333 Moscow TASS in English 1142 GMT
25 Feb 88*

[Text] Prague February 25 TASS—The withdrawal of the missile units of the Soviet Army, equipped with shorter-range missiles, from the territory of Czechoslovakia begins under an accord between the Governments of the USSR and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, a spokesman for the Czechoslovak Foreign Ministry said here. The sole basis of Soviet shorter-range missiles in Czechoslovak territory, which has OTR-22 missiles, is located in the area of the military range near the city of Hranice-on-the-Morava.

This step is a manifestation of good will, a constructive example which will serve further to ameliorate the international atmosphere, the Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed. This is a fresh and forceful prove that the USSR fulfills its obligations consistently and honestly before the treaty went into effect.

The OTR-22 shorter-range missiles were deployed in Czechoslovak territory as a retaliatory move to the stationing of U.S. "Pershing-2" and cruise missiles in several West European countries in the interests of ensuring the security of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and its allies. The missiles and their launchers will be moved to the USSR where they will be destroyed following the ratification of the treaty.

In the situation where there is a real hope that the INF Treaty will enter into force already in the first half of this year, the Soviet missiles can be moved outside Czechoslovakia without the creation of a threat to its security.

Czechoslovakia becomes once again a country without nuclear weapons. It is highly important now that the process of ratifying the treaty in the U.S. Senate pass successfully so that moves can be made to get down to its fast implementation, the spokesman for the Czechoslovak Foreign Ministry emphasized.

NATO's 'Contradictory' Signals on Arms Race

*LD232055 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1610 GMT 23 Feb 88*

[From "The World Today" program, presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] Shultz has arrived in Brussels. He has met with the foreign ministers of the NATO member countries in order to brief them on the talks held in Moscow, and on the preparations for the new meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan, which should take place in the Soviet Union in the first half of this year.

The signals coming from NATO headquarters are fairly contradictory. On the one hand, the United States' West European allies express support for the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and approve of the efforts to draw up an even bigger agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic nuclear weapons. At the same time, plans are being drawn up for a NATO military buildup with the aim of, as it is put, compensating for the imaginary gap in NATO's defenses, which will supposedly develop as a result of the scrapping of two classes of nuclear missiles. Several NATO figures advocate compensating for this by building up other nuclear means. According to the weekly OBSERVER, NATO is planning to deploy twice as many nuclear warheads in Western Europe, to take the place of those that are to be destroyed. True, British Foreign Secretary Howe, replying to journalists' questions in Moscow, denied that the decisions to do this have already been taken.

However, the plans do exist. Our country speaks out in determined fashion against an arms race developing along certain lines, at the same time as disarmament is continuing on other lines.

Gerasimov Holds News Conference 24 Feb

On Nagorno-Karabakh Events

LD241521 Moscow TASS in English 1500 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 24 TASS—A number of questions by foreign correspondents at today's press briefing in the press centre of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs concerned the latest events in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic where, as is known, a part of the Armenian population demanded the inclusion of Nagorno-Karabakh in the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Replying to these questions the head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Gennadiy Gerasimov said that today he had a telephone conversation with Armenia's minister of foreign affairs concerning the demonstrations in Yerevan in connection with the events in Nagorno-Karabakh. "The demonstrations in the Armenian capital were of a peaceful nature", the minister told him.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said that the CPSU Central Committee, consistently adhering to the Leninist principles of the nationalities policy, had appealed to the patriotic and internationalist feelings of the Armenian and Azerbaijanian population not to fall for the provocations of nationalistic elements and to strengthen in every way the great asset of socialism—the fraternal friendship of the Soviet peoples.

The party and government bodies of the two republics have been offered to normalise the situation around Nagorno-Karabakh, Gennadiy Gerasimov said. It can be conjectured that meetings of party activists will be held shortly in Armenia and Azerbaijan.

On N. Europe NATO Forces

LD241503 Moscow TASS in English 1450 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 24 TASS—"The possible replacement of a Canadian brigade intended, formally, to defend the north of Norway in a crisis situation by troops of other NATO countries, in particular the FRG, is being mentioned lately in the press and statements by officials in north European countries", a press briefing here today was told by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "In turn", he went on, "a spokesman of the British Defence Ministry announced a change in the plans of combat operations of the Royal Navy and its movement in a period of tension closer to Soviet borders".

"Obviously, such plans and intentions do not lead to a lowering of military confrontation in the north European region", Gerasimov said further. "The concentration of

armed forces and armaments, especially navies, is great there as it is. Its further growth lately is done by the navies of NATO countries and explained by the old thesis of defence of northern Norway in crisis situations, a thesis accepting a priori an aggressive directedness of Soviet policy".

The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman recalled that lately the Soviet Union had taken a number of important measures, including unilateral ones, directed at easing military tension in that region. Last October Mikhail Gorbachev set forth in Murmansk a multifaceted concrete programme of scaling down military activity and lowering the level of military confrontation and strengthening extensive peaceful cooperation in the Arctic and North Atlantic. This programme was spelled out in greater detail during Nikolay Ryzhkov's visit to Sweden and Norway. "We are right to expect constructive reply steps by NATO", Gennadiy Gerasimov stressed.

On Strengthening of UN Role

LD241455 Moscow TASS in English 1419 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 24 TASS—"The Soviet Union attaches great importance to enhancing the United Nations' efficiency in safeguarding universal security and preventing international disputes and conflicts," a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a briefing here today.

Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, was addressing Soviet and foreign journalists in connection with the opening in New York of a regular session of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and the strengthening of the role of the organization.

"The USSR favours all-round enhancement of U.N. authority, consolidation of its political, legal and moral status and democratization of the activity of the United Nations and its main bodies," Gerasimov pointed out.

"We believe that the United Nations' efficiency can be secured through strict observance of the Charter's provisions, adoption by states of additional unilateral commitments, elaboration of coordinated confidence-building measures and international cooperation."

"The Soviet delegation to the session will work to this effect," the ministry spokesman said.

'Support' for Afghan Statement

LD241348 Moscow TASS in English 1310 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 24 TASS—The understanding and support with which Mikhail Gorbachev's statement on Afghanistan and the initiatives made in it have been received in Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Nigeria

have caused a feeling of satisfaction in the Soviet Union, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said at a briefing here today.

Gerasimov, chief of the ministry's Information Directorate, also hailed the serious and realistic attitude to the Soviet Union's steps, which has been taken in statements by Iraqi and Turkish Foreign Ministry spokesmen.

Senior foreign officials have expressed confidence that the Soviet leader's statement will make a positive impact on the entire international situation and that settling the Afghan issue will make it easier to move to fair solutions to other regional conflicts as well.

But a different position has also been in evidence, Gerasimov noted. He said Pakistani Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Zain Noorani has attempted to distort the statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, seeing it as a kind of "ultimatum".

"If we are to speak of ultimatums and of a reluctance to solve the Afghan problem through peaceful talks, then obviously we'll have to speak of Islamabad and the 'Alliance of the Seven' it has taken under its wing," Gerasimov said.

Alliance of Seven 'Obstacle'

LD241429 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 24 TASS—There is currently a single lawful Government of Afghanistan, which is represented in the United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement and international organizations, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said today.

Gerasimov, chief of the ministry's Information Directorate, said at a briefing here that the Afghan Government pursuing a national reconciliation policy had said it did not claim the monopoly of power and it had suggested that opposition forces go into talks to form a coalition government.

"We are convinced that domestic Afghan problems, including the government's structure, should be resolved by Afghans themselves and exclusively by peaceful means, through a broad-based inter-Afghan dialogue," he continued.

Commenting on a "comprehensive structure for Afghanistan's transitional government" hurriedly worked out by the "Alliance of the Seven" in Peshawar just ahead of another round of talks in Geneva, Gerasimov said it was obvious that the artificial structure could not be seen as a lawful representative of the Afghan people.

"It is an attempt to torpedo the process of national reconciliation, undermine the Geneva talks and frustrate the attainment of final agreements there," Gerasimov said.

He called attention to the fact that the action by the Peshawar-based "Alliance of the Seven" was conspicuously consonant with the latest series of statements by the Pakistani leadership about its unwillingness to sign the Geneva agreements with the lawful Government of Afghanistan.

"Previously, Pakistan never raised the issue of who it would be signing the Geneva agreements with, while now that all the remaining issues, most notably those of the time-frame and schedule for the Soviet troop withdrawal, have been solved, it is throwing up a new, clearly artificial obstacle," Gerasimov said.

UK Military Exercises Scored

LD241410 Moscow TASS in English 1348 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 24 TASS—Our view is that large-scale military exercises which Great Britain plans to hold in the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands in March, run counter to the interests of the normalisation of the situation in the south Atlantic. They contradict peaceful aspirations of Latin American countries, appropriate decisions of the United Nations General Assembly, do not suit the aim of creating a zone of peace and cooperation in the region, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Minister Gennadiy Gerasimov said at a briefing here today. [sentence as received]

"The Soviet Union is on a principled stand in favour of an early settlement of the problem of Malvinas (Falkland) Islands and holds that this can be achieved through serious talks between Argentina and Britain on the basis of the United Nations Charter and appropriate resolutions of the General Assembly," Gennadiy Gerasimov said.

Balkan Foreign Ministers Meet in Belgrade

SFRY's Mojsov Opens Session

LD241314 Moscow TASS in English 1240 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Belgrade February 24 TASS—TASS special correspondents Viktor Kuznetsov and Vladimir Matyash report:

A meeting of the foreign ministers of Balkan countries opened in Belgrade today. It is attended by the heads of foreign offices from Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Romania, Turkey and Yugoslavia. They will discuss regional and international issues, bilateral and multilateral cooperation in the Balkans, a proposal by socialist countries (Bulgaria and Romania) on establishing here a zone, free from nuclear and chemical weapons. A place of prominence will be given to the question on more active involvement of Balkan states in the general European process. A detailed exchange of opinions will be held on

issues of cooperation in economy, co-production and specialization, the power industry, agriculture, transport, science, technology, culture and the environmental control.

Meeting participants were warmly greeted by Lazar Mojsov, president of the collective presidency of Yugoslavia. He expressed the hope that the Belgrade meeting would help strengthen peace and international security in this part of the world and expand bilateral and multilateral cooperation between the Balkan states.

The forum in the Yugoslav capital aroused great interest in the countries of the Balkan peninsula and in Europe as a whole. More than 800 Yugoslav and foreign journalists, representatives of radio and television are accredited at the meeting's press centre.

Foreign Ministers Speak

LD241944 Moscow TASS in English 1852 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Belgrade February 24 TASS—Special TASS correspondents Anatoliy Bocharov, Viktor Kuznetsov, Vladimir Matyash report:

Albanian Foreign Minister Reis Malile was the first to take the floor at a plenary meeting of the ministers of foreign affairs of the Balkan countries. He expressed the hope that the exchange of opinions will help create a climate of confidence and mutual understanding, will be promoting the development of bilateral and multilateral cooperation in the region. The Albanian Government supports all constructive steps that might contribute to the improvement of the situation in the Balkans and serve the cause of peace, stability and security in the region.

The Albanian representative said that the idea of creating nuclear weapons free Balkans is a constructive one and coincides with the interests of security in the Balkan peninsula and, on a broader scale, in Europe. He emphasized that Albania supports equitable demands of all the Balkan countries for the withdrawal of foreign arsenals of nuclear weapons from the territory of the Balkan peninsula, which would help improve the political climate in the region.

Bulgaria attaches priority importance to turning the Balkans into a zone free from nuclear and chemical weapons in accordance with the requirements of new political thinking, said Bulgaria's Foreign Minister Petur Mladenov. Bulgaria holds that weapons of mass destruction deployed in the territories of some Balkan countries target Bulgaria and other countries of the region and should therefore be eliminated. This will remove the main destabilizing factor in the Balkans.

Bulgaria views the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles as the beginning of the process of real nuclear

disarmament. The signing of the treaty means a historic victory of political realism, will and readiness for a reasonable compromise in the solution of the vitally important problems facing humanity. The Bulgarian minister declared for the signing of a concrete agreement about the non-emplacement of nuclear, chemical and conventional weapons and foreign troops in the territories of the Balkan states and of naval ships in their waters.

Yugoslavia highly appraises the fact that foreign ministers of all the Balkan countries gathered at a negotiating table, said Yugoslavia's Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs Budimir Loncar. This shows that there exists the objective need and political will to promote, through close and broad cooperation, the solution of vital problems in the interests of the Balkan peoples and countries.

The meeting takes place in the period of the easing of international tension, he went on to say. No one can remain indifferent to this process, as the common responsibility for the destinies of peace comes to the fore at the turn of epochs.

Budimir Loncar said that Yugoslavia holds a positive stand in the question of turning the Balkans into a zone free from nuclear and chemical weapons.

Touching upon the development of multilateral cooperation in the region, he submitted on behalf of Yugoslavia a proposal to hold regular meetings of foreign ministers of the Balkan countries.

Turks Bypass U.S. Bases Issue

LD242221 Moscow TASS in English 2201 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Belgrade February 24 TASS—TASS special correspondents report:

The political discussion on topical questions of the situation in the region, development of bilateral and multilateral cooperation between states of the region continued at the evening plenary session of the current Belgrade meeting of the foreign ministers of six Balkan countries. Most of the speakers supported Bulgaria's and Romania's proposal that a zone free from nuclear and chemical weapons be formed in the Balkan peninsula, as an important step on the road towards improvement of the political climate in the peninsula. Speakers positively appraised the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of the Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles as a historic event which laid the beginning to the process of real nuclear disarmament.

The Government of Greece supports the proposal that the Balkan peninsula should become a zone free from nuclear and chemical weapons, for which it is necessary to create an atmosphere of confidence and mutual understanding, said Foreign Minister of the Republic of Greece Karolos Papoulias. He put forward the proposal

that a Balkan summit meeting be held which would enrich the process ushered in Belgrade and would be a new important step in the development of cooperation between the Balkan states.

Romania's Foreign Minister Ioan Totu said in his speech that the Socialist Republic of Romania welcomed the INF agreement, considering it as the first important step on the road to destruction of all nuclear arsenals. He declared for continued efforts aimed at a 50 percent reduction of the strategic nuclear armaments, and then their full destruction. Having supported the idea for the Balkan peninsula to become a nuclear-free zone, the Romanian representative called upon all countries of the region, as the first concrete step towards attaining this goal, to refrain from deploying such weapons on their territory and from modernising the existing nuclear arsenals. On behalf of the Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania Ioan Totu proposed that the Balkan summit meeting be held late this year or in the first half of 1989 in Bucharest.

There are now reassuring signs showing that our region is advancing to establishing a zone of peace, stability, goodneighbourliness and mutually-beneficial cooperation, said Turkey's Foreign Minister Mesut Yilmaz. Turkey and Greece, he said, have shown a good example in this respect. The reconciliation process the beginning to which was laid by the recent meeting of the prime ministers of the two countries, will be to the mutual benefit of the Turkish and Greek peoples. The Turkish foreign minister said that the INF agreement was a historic agreement and expressed the hope that it would be followed by other steps in the sphere of nuclear disarmament. He declared in favour of reduction of strategic offensive, chemical and conventional armaments. But at the same time Turkey's representative did not express his concrete opinion on questions linked with the establishing in the Balkan peninsula a zone free from nuclear and chemical weapons, the idea of which is enlisting growing support in the region and Europe as a whole. He bypassed in silence also the question of the presence of a great many American military bases on Turkey's territory, which threaten neighbouring Balkan states, peace and security in the region.

As was reported by the news agency TANJUG, a message from the Foreign Minister of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze has come to address of the president of the Belgrade meeting—Federal Secretary on Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Budimir Loncar. The message wishes the forum successful and fruitful work. It was distributed amid the delegations of six Balkan countries.

Romania's Totu Suggests Summit

LD250945 Moscow TASS in English 0901 GMT
25 Feb 88

[Text] Belgrade February 25 TASS—Today is the second day of the Balkan foreign ministers' meeting. The ministers of foreign affairs of Albania, Bulgaria, Greece,

Romania, Turkey, and Yugoslavia at a close-door morning session will continue to discuss regional and international issues and, in particular, Bulgaria's and Romania's proposal to establish in the region a zone free from nuclear and chemical weapons.

The interests of all Balkan countries without exception in strengthening peace and security on the peninsula, in establishing an all-Balkan dialogue and in developing regional cooperation in various fields was emphasized during a political discussion on Wednesday. It was specially pointed out that an improvement of the political climate in the Balkans, which won the grim notoriety of a "powder keg" in Europe's southern outlying regions, would be not only of benefit to the countries of the region but would also have a positive effect on the situation in Europe and in the world as a whole. Practically all representatives of Balkan countries expressed support for the treaty, which the Soviet Union and the United States signed in Washington in December 1987, on the elimination of intermediate and shorter-range missiles, and pointed out that the accord was an event of historic significance marking the beginning of a process of real nuclear disarmament.

During the exchange of views, Ioan Totu, Romanian minister of foreign affairs, on behalf of the country's leadership suggested holding a Balkan summit meeting in Bucharest at the end of this year or in the first half of 1989. Budimir Loncar, Yugoslav federal secretary for foreign affairs, for his part proposed holding regular meetings of Balkan foreign ministers.

Summing up the results of the political discussion, the TANJUG news agency writes: "At their first-ever meeting, the Balkan foreign ministers devoted special attention to what should unite the countries of the region and may become a foundation of cooperation in the Balkans. All speakers at the meeting showed aspiration to ensure, stimulate and enrich the development of cooperation in the Balkan peninsula through specific proposals and initiatives".

'International Review' of Week's Events

PM241439 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Feb 88
Second Edition p 4

[Yevgeniy Grigoryev "International Review": "The World During the Week"]

[Text] The worldwide interest in our restructuring seems to have become a constant in contemporary international life. One is once again convinced of this by the foreign responses to the CPSU Central Committee plenum devoted to problems of secondary and higher schools. It has turned out that this aspect of the work on the qualitative renewal of socialist society also attracts rapt attention everywhere. The very first comments convey the profound impression made on the world by the plenum speech of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary

of the CPSU Central Committee. Its international sections provide the key to a still clearer understanding of the scientific foundations, principles, and priorities of the USSR's contemporary line in the world and of its purposefulness and honesty in the struggle to exclude war from international politics.

About Ratification [subhead]

The conclusion of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles was an important step on this path. The treaty marks the starting point of new processes in international development and the start of real disarmament. But it still has to acquire a legislative pass into life.

The ratification work was continued in both Moscow and Washington this week. We held hearings in the preparatory commission—the working group of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet. In the U.S. Congress, discussions were held in the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees (open) and in the Committee on Intelligence (closed).

A unique feature of the process of legislative approval of the INF Treaty is the fact that it is proceeding, if I may put it like this, under very vigilant supervision by public forces, the people's masses, and even many governments. It is difficult to draw an analogy where a bilateral document has been regarded and perceived to such a high degree as an achievement and asset belonging to the whole world. Leaders of many states—even ones whose ruling circles would not want the elimination of nuclear weapons—do not miss an opportunity to come out in support of the treaty and its speediest ratification.

The data from a poll conducted in West Europe for the USIA are significant. The treaty is welcomed by numbers ranging from 78 percent of those polled in France to 97 percent in the FRG. There is no doubt that the sympathies of the overwhelming majority of Americans are also on its side.

This is evidently affecting the tone of speeches in the U.S. Congress. The lists of speakers invited to expound their views to the Senate committees this week featured many names well known for "hawkishness," such as former U.S. Assistant Defense Secretary R. Perle. In this instance, Perle deemed it right to speak in favor of ratification, as did Z. Brzezinski, former U.S. presidential assistant. General B. Rogers, the recent NATO commander in chief, also noted in his turn "some positive aspects" of the treaty, although he is horrified that West Europe is being "pushed onto a slippery path leading to the abandonment of nuclear weapons."

The conclusion suggests itself that it is not only a thankless but also a quite difficult task to oppose ratification under the conditions taking shape. However, the

treaty's opponents are not laying down their arms, neither inside nor outside Congress. At the same time, the methods are becoming increasingly unscrupulous and are clearly designed to change "at a stroke," so to speak, the predominant mood of the U.S. public and poison the atmosphere of the ratification process with anti-Soviet suspicion and hostility. What is the worth of the "canard" about the Soviet Union's alleged concealment of more than 150 SS-20 missiles? Or the sally by former television preacher P. Robertson, one of the Republican Party's aspiring presidential candidates, who claimed that the USSR keeps intermediate-range missiles in Cuba? It was such an absurd lie that even the Pentagon refuted it. It cannot be ruled out that, for lack of arguments, other provocations may also follow.

Their potential danger is quite obvious if you consider the election struggle now raging in the United States, as well as the braking effect of the political thinking which still prevails in Washington. The arms race policy has in no way been consigned to the archives there. Therefore, during the hearings in the Senate committees, the conclusion of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is frequently presented as a "triumph" for the policy of force and military pressure on the Soviet Union. There then follow recommendations to continue the military muscle building, to modernize the remaining nuclear forces in the European theater of military operations, and so forth.

Understanding of and regard for the realities of the modern world are making headway in Washington with tremendous difficulty. The contradictions of U.S. politics and behavior do not facilitate the cause of improving the international situation but, as experience shows, neither can they reverse new trends expressed in the signing of the INF Treaty. These, too, are the dialectics of modern world development.

European Affairs [subhead]

This week Moscow received British Foreign Secretary G. Howe, who arrived on an official visit. Soviet-British relations are an important sector in the European area of our policy. Particularly now—in the context of the political dialogue with the West. Accordingly, the conversations and talks embraced the most urgent and substantial problems on the world, European, and regional planes. I believe that the guest felt the amicability, directness, and openness of the Soviet political language, our special attentiveness toward European affairs, and our desire for unity of word and practice. Both sides considered that the conversation held in the Kremlin was interesting and useful and agreed to weigh what in it must serve further rapprochement and what really divides them.

All London newspapers reproduced the secretary's resume, according to which Soviet-British relations are in a better state than ever since the war. If this is so, then,

consequently, there is a prospect of their further development. But the problems, too, are obvious, chiefly in the approaches to disarmament—an essential, priority construction, if you bear in mind the building of the all-European home.

During his visit Sir G. Howe took advantage of glasnost, which is hardly available to him to such a degree at home: If you count the circulations of PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA, his views were disseminated textually in numbers in excess of 21 million copies. We learned from that speech what the Soviet Union must do in both domestic and foreign policy. But it seems that an opportunity was missed to satisfy the Soviet people's natural curiosity about how, specifically, Britain intends to act, above all in the interests of strengthening peace and security in Europe. A year ago Mr Howe told our London correspondent that at a certain stage, Britain will be ready to be a partner in ridding the planet of nuclear weapons, but now, in Moscow, he campaigned for the unconditional preservation of these weapons in general and the British weapons in particular. Hardly anyone in our country can accept "arguments" in favor of nuclear weapons and their improvement and stockpiling in Europe. Precisely this, alas, is the British position.

The leaders of a number of NATO countries—primarily Britain and France—perceive the prospects of a nuclear-free Europe as a "threat." They draw up the priorities for "averting" it—first the elimination of the chemical potential and of the "imbalances" in conventional arms, and only sometime later further discussion of nuclear arms. During a recent visit to NATO headquarters, British Prime Minister M. Thatcher made, in particular, the following statement: "We ignore to our cost the fact that Soviet policy abroad still poses a serious threat. The Soviet Union's chief aim is to break West Europe away from the United States, destroy NATO unity, and weaken allied defenses. A nuclear-free Europe would excellently serve to achieve that aim." It can hardly be assumed that London was not aware of the total arbitrariness of that interpretation of the Soviet aims, which has nothing in common with the theory and practice of USSR foreign policy and the new political thinking. True, you cannot envy the limited choice that certain Western leaders have, since everything will fall apart at the seams without the "Soviet threat."

Meanwhile, preparations are under way for the Brussels meeting of the NATO countries' heads of state and government. Such a Western allied council could in itself prove very topical and important. Everyone can see that, apart from the military programs, NATO has neither a modern disarmament concept nor a political concept; this puts its leaders in an intolerable position after the conclusion of the INF Treaty. In addition, NATO is "up to its ears in debt" in terms of replies owed to the Warsaw Pact countries' constructive initiatives and proposals, whether this concerns the elaboration of a mandate in Vienna, the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces, the examination of "imbalances," the

comparison of military doctrines, and so forth. Unfortunately, what we now know of the views of the chief NATO allies prompts us to assume that the "Brussels concept" will be based on NATO's immutable military principles with the emphasis on the "need" to keep nuclear components. But there are many mysteries here, and the West European picture is distinguished by a diversity of colors.

London is calling for a start on the modernization of both nuclear and conventional arms, but particularly nuclear missiles with a range of up to 500 km. Bonn is so far rejecting the improvement of the existing tactical missiles in the FRG and the siting of new ones there and is advocating a chemical weapons ban, as well as "verifiable reductions in short-range nuclear systems," but not a "triple-zero option." To judge from reports, this position was confirmed by Chancellor H. Kohl during the talks which he has just had in Washington. Paris voices solidarity with Britain in its negativism toward the idea of a nuclear-free Europe but disagrees with it in questions of "European defense." For the British Government, NATO is the basis of security. But Paris and Bonn are seeking to reactivate the WEU as NATO's "European mainstay." At the same time, London and Bonn favor the preservation of the NATO "flexible response" strategy, while President Mitterrand has recently spoken repeatedly of its unacceptability. France and the FRG are accelerating their military cooperation, which displeases London, Rome, and other NATO allies. Paris and London are nurturing plans for the joint development and production of air-to-ground nuclear systems. Even the bloc members themselves find it difficult to get to the bottom of this kaleidoscope. In this connection, certain Western newspapers are writing of a "NATO crisis." If this is so, the reasons for it lie in the increasingly critical bankruptcy of the orientation toward militarist thinking. It is this that prompts certain Western political and military circles to undertake a dangerous search for "compensation" for the nuclear weapons being removed under the INF Treaty.

However, it is precisely this treaty, which proves the possibility of nuclear disarmament, that is having, like the USSR's constructive line, a strong impact on European sentiments, especially as there are obvious new opportunities in the matter of strengthening European peace and security.

They are pointed to, in particular, by the Socialist International leaders' joint statement just published in Geneva. Life is prompting West Europeans to seek concepts other than the usual, dangerous stereotypes of confrontational thinking. The views of such a cultured mind as Italian Foreign Minister G. Andreotti are interesting in this plane. Calling for "a still more determined gamble on negotiations," he writes: "The new idea which must be verified in practice consists in whether it is possible to replace the concept of simple coexistence between East and West, between the two camps, with the

concept of interdependence... Mutual competition must not disappear, but it is acquiring a more political nature. Europe is having to encounter a political challenge rather than a military threat."

As we see, European affairs are not standing still.

Good News [subhead]

A conflict over a disputed border territory covering 75-80 square km flared up once again on the Lao-Thai border at the end of last year. Regular troops, including artillery and aircraft, were involved in military operations. Both sides suffered considerable casualties. The raging conflict threatened to still further complicate the situation in the region, where an acute regional problem such as the Cambodian one already exists.

The Lao People's Democratic Republic [LPDR] displayed lofty responsibility. An appeal from Kayson Phomvihane, the LPDR leader, to Thai Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanon set in motion the process of a peace settlement by political means. The Thai leadership was sensible in return and agreed to talks.

Now good news has come out of Bangkok. As a result of the talks, military delegations from the two neighboring countries agreed on a cease-fire and a troop disengagement as of 19 February. The senseless bloodshed and

killing of the population has been ended. At the same time, it has been decided to begin political negotiations on settling the border problem within 15 days. The leaders of both delegations gave assurances that there will be no further recourse to military force.

Laos and Thailand have done an important thing by ending the armed conflict. They have proved once again that it is possible to find a way out of difficult situations through negotiation. This is valuable experience for the modern world, where many regional conflicts await a settlement.

Briefs

Accord Against Air Terrorism

Ottawa February 25 TASS—In Montreal, representatives of the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Belorussian SSR signed on February 24 a protocol against terrorists in airports. The document, drawn up at a diplomatic conference held under the aegis of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), provides for measures to intensify struggle against terrorist actions in airports servicing international civil aviation. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2301 GMT 24 Feb 88 LD]

United States & Canada

U.S. Plans To Destroy Outdated Chemical Weapons

LD241752 Moscow TASS in English 1723 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 24 TASS—Under Secretary of the U.S. Army James Ambrose announced on Tuesday the Pentagon's intention to destroy stockpiles of outdated chemical weapons.

In his words, the weapons would be destroyed in eight storage areas.

If Congress approved allocations for these purposes, estimated at 2-2.5 billion dollars, Ambrose said, the work would begin in 1989 or 1990.

He refused to say what stocks of chemical weapons the United States possessed at the present time. According to ASSOCIATED PRESS, they were estimated at 25,000-40,000 tons.

This arsenal, according to plans of the U.S. Administration, would be considerably expanded thanks to the production of new types of chemical weapons.

Earlier this month, U.S. President Ronald Reagan notified Congress of the decision to sanction the production of a chemical binary air bomb, Bigeye, saying it was of vital importance for national security.

The Pentagon has already started talks with building contractors on establishing a corresponding industrial base. 90 million dollars were set aside for these purposes. The production of bombs is to be started in the 1990s.

The Bigeye is one of the three types of new-generation chemical weapons the production of which was started or planned by the United States recently.

Late last year, the U.S. began assembling binary munitions for the artillery. The Pentagon is designing a binary warhead for multiple rocket launchers. These steps are being undertaken in keeping with the decision to start large-scale production of chemical warfare agents adopted by the White House six years ago.

Reagan Comments at News Conference 24 Feb

On Shultz Trips, Contra Aid

LD250940 Moscow TASS in English 0903 GMT
25 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 25 TASS—President Reagan addressed a press conference Wednesday night, the first one this year.

Touching upon the results of the trip to Moscow of U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, he described them as encouraging. "Progress continues to be made on our four-part agenda and the commitment remains to do all that we can to advance the cause of peace and to settle regional conflicts", he said.

Reagan pointed out that the purpose of the coming trip of Shultz to the Middle East was "to see if practical and real progress can be made that provides a pathway to a comprehensive settlement". The President emphasized that any settlement process "must meet Israel's security needs and satisfy the legitimate rights of the Palestinians".

The President expressed disappointment over the fact that the House of Representatives of U.S. Congress voted against the continuation of U.S. military assistance to the Nicaraguan contras.

On Middle East, Nicaragua

LD251214 Moscow TASS in English 1135 GMT
25 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 25 TASS—TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

President Reagan held a press conference Wednesday that was broadcast by U.S. national television. At the beginning of his statement he said that U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz had informed him of the results of his trip to Moscow which, according to the President, were "encouraging". "Progress continues to be made on our four-part agenda and the commitment remains to do all that we can to advance the cause of peace and to settle regional conflicts", President Reagan pointed out.

Passing over to the coming trip of George Shultz to the Middle East, the President said that its purpose was "to see if practical and real progress can be made that provides a pathway to a comprehensive settlement" in the region. At the same time, he pointed out that "any process that is undertaken must meet Israel's security needs and satisfy the legitimate rights of the Palestinians". Reagan did not specify what rights he had in mind.

The first question the journalists put to President Reagan was the following: "Through the years you have been very much eloquent on the subject of human rights in the Soviet Union and Nicaragua. Why ... have you never condemned the treatment of the Palestinians in the occupied areas, shooting unarmed protesters, beating people to death, children, trying to bury some alive?... Why don't you go on the public record now and say that there should be an exchange of removal of the occupation and peace?"

In his answer the President confined himself to making assurance to the effect that "we have spoken to the government there and we have spoken to the Palestinian

leadership" and that "we do not support that sort of things". He added that "we are trying to persuade all the participants to try to arrive at a solution representing justice for all". Thus, he actually put on the same footing the Israeli invaders and their victims. The President said that "these riots are not just spontaneous and home-grown" and refused to answer the question on whom precisely he criticized when he said that the riots were not home-grown and spontaneous.

The President expressed disappointment over the fact that the House of Representatives of U.S. Congress had voted against the continuation of U.S. military assistance to the Nicaraguan contras. He said further that "the only comment that I can make there is that anything that will keep the freedom fighters as a pressure on the Sandinistas is worth doing" and spoke out in favour of the granting of U.S. assistance to the contras by the CIA channels.

Reagan was asked about the attitude of his administration to the new rigorous measures taken by the racist regime of South Africa against organizations opposing apartheid. He said that the Department of State had already contacted the South African Government about that. "We are making our own feelings clear that they should be working toward a multiracial democracy", he said. The President answered in the negative the question on whether the U.S. Administration was going to help those who are fighting for freedom and against oppression in South Africa.

The secret operation on U.S. arms sales to Iran and the diversion of part of the profits to the Nicaraguan contras was again mentioned at the press conference. The President actually admitted that this had been done with a view to influencing the internal situation in Nicaragua. One of the journalists called attention to the fact that the President had never condemned the actions of those members of his staff who had been involved in the illegal "Iran-contras" deal. The question was raised whether his silence meant that he did not find their actions objectionable. The President did not give a concrete answer to this question.

Reagan Speaks of Upcoming NATO Meeting
LD250343 Moscow Television Service in Russian
2020 GMT 24 Feb 88

[From "The World Today" program, presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] Washington. President Reagan has spoken on U.S. television in connection with the upcoming NATO Council session at the level of heads of states. He stressed that the continuation of the talks with the Soviet Union on questions of arms control [kontrol nad vooruzheniyami], which have already resulted in the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, must be an important part of the strategy of the Atlantic bloc. This treaty is a step on the road

towards strengthening peace, Reagan said. This is precisely what the talks on reducing the arsenals of strategic arms of the United States and the Soviet Union by 50 percent, which are now under way in Geneva, are aimed at.

At the same time, President Reagan called for a strengthening of the NATO bloc, a continuation of the policy from a position of strength vis a vis the USSR and other Warsaw Pact member countries. The Atlantic alliance is the basis of U.S. foreign policy and of the security of the United States, Reagan stated.

Shultz Reports to Reagan on Moscow Talks
LD242242 Moscow TASS in English 2224 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 25 TASS—President Reagan met on Wednesday with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz who was back in Washington for one day to personally inform the head of the administration on the results of the Soviet-American high level negotiations in Moscow this week. All aspects of Soviet-American relations were considered in detail and the process of preparations began for a new summit meeting, planned to be held in Moscow in the first half of 1988, in the course of conversations in which Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Colin Powell participated. During the photography ceremony in the Oval Room of the White House before the talk with Shultz President Reagan avoided answering journalists' questions on the results of the negotiations which ended in Moscow.

At the meeting with Shultz Reagan also discussed the coming trip of the U.S. secretary of state to the Middle East. He is to fly there in the evening of February 24. As was announced by the Department of State, the tour will take Shultz to Israel, Egypt, Jordan and Syria. An official representative of the Department of State refused to disclose other details pertaining to Shultz's visit to the Middle East.

Comparison of Shevardnadze-Shultz Talks

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 22 February 1988 carries in its Second Edition on page 5 a report on the talks held by USSR Foreign Affairs Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. The PRAVDA report, entitled "Talks in Moscow," has been compared with the Moscow TASS in English version published in the 22 February DAILY REPORT on pages 22-23 under the subhead "'Substantive' Discussion Held," revealing the following variations:

Page 22, column two, paragraph two, reads in PRAVDA: [Text] U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz arrived in Moscow 21 February in accordance with an existing arrangement. He was accompanied by C. Powell, U.S. national security adviser.

They were met at Sheremetyevo-1 airport by Yu.M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister; Yu.V. Dubinin, USSR ambassador to the United States; and other officials.

J.F. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR, was among the welcoming party.

Talks between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister; and G. Shultz began the same day. (adding passage)

Page 23, column two, paragraph five, reads in PRAVDA: E.A. Shevardnadze's talks with G. Shultz are being held mainly in small sessions with the participation of A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy foreign minister, and V.P. Karpov, member of the USSR Foreign Ministry Collegium, on the Soviet side; and of C. Powell and R. Ridgway, U.S. assistant secretary of state, on the U.S. side.

A plenary session was also held, in which other officials took part: on the Soviet side—Yu.M. Vorontsov; A.L. Adamishin, USSR deputy foreign minister; Yu.V. Dubinin; S.P. Tarasenko, member of the USSR Foreign Ministry Collegium; A.A. Obukhov, head of the USSR delegation at the talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva; and V.M. Sukhodrev, deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry United States and Canada Department; and on the American side—M. Armacost, U.S. under secretary for political affairs; M. Kampelman, chief of the U.S. delegation at the talks on nuclear and space arms, and adviser to the secretary of state; P. Nitze, adviser to the President and secretary of state on arms reduction; J.F. Matlock; R. Lehman, deputy defense secretary [title as published]; and W. Burns, director of the arms control and disarmament agency. (adding passage)

Same column, paragraph six, sole sentence, reads in PRAVDA: ...will be continued. (omitting final passage)

Bessmertnykh on Shultz Talks in Moscow
LD242009 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1625 GMT 24 Feb 88

[From "The World Today" program; interview with Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov at the USSR Foreign Ministry on 24 February—recorded]

[Text] [Seyful-Mulyukov] Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, you have quite recently participated in the talks between the Soviet leadership and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. I would like to ask you a few questions in this connection.

At the February plenum of the CPSU Central Committee fears were expressed as regards the actions of the extreme rightwing forces in the United States and in the West as a whole, forces that would like to stop the train

of disarmament. Do you believe the results of another sequence in the Soviet-U.S. dialogue in Moscow during Shultz's visit have to some extent dispelled these fears?

[Bessmertnykh] In some respects after the signing of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles was attained, these forces are active again in trying to oppose any sort of accords in the sphere of the strengthening of security. However, what is involved here is to what extent another tendency which is at present gathering strength can now oppose these forces. This tendency is first of all quite objective. We see that the support of the U.S. population and public opinion throughout the world is increasing in favor of further measures aimed at arms limitation and reduction. The Moscow talks were undoubtedly a certain stage in this process. If the U.S. Administration truly reflects the leanings and interests of its own population, and if it heeds public opinion in its own country, naturally it will have to form its policy in accordance with it. If the U.S. Administration had formed its policy considering rightwing opinions only, which it considers to some extent anyway because this is a pre-election year—a very important one for the Republicans and Democrats as well as for the administration—if it had formed its stand only in accordance with the leanings of only one segment in public opinion, then we would probably have failed to reach those accords that have already been attained. Nor could we have counted on achieving other agreements which it is possible to achieve now.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, are there any grounds for optimism on the question of whether the U.S. Administration will have a realistic attitude toward matters relating to the observance of the ABM Treaty when the treaty on the 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons is drawn up? How was this issue considered during the Moscow talks?

[Bessmertnykh] I must say you have touched upon the heart of the problem that is now being discussed with the Americans as part of the issue of the 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons. We proceed from a very clear and distinct concept: It is impossible to achieve further radical reductions in nuclear weapons, still less in those which belong to the category of strategic offensive weapons, without the clear understanding that the ABM Treaty will be strictly observed. What is more, it must be observed exactly as it was signed.

What is the point of this linkage, anyway? This is not just to do with considering the linkage of these issues as a legal matter. This issue belongs to the category of very fundamental things. If we are opting for the 50-percent reduction, which is a very high figure, we must be confident that stability, military and strategic stability, will remain in reliable hands. We must safeguard ourselves from unpleasant surprises, as far as our military security and self-defense are concerned. This is why we are insisting that the ABM Treaty be observed.

In the December meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan, we achieved a certain clarity on this account at the highest level. We established that the reduction of the strategic offensive weapons will be carried out under the conditions of the observance of the ABM Treaty as it was signed in 1972. Later, however, the U.S. delegation in Geneva, tried to go back on this accord after the summit meeting. Therefore the question of the ABM Treaty observance was undoubtedly a central issue in Moscow.

During this conversation clarity was again restored, basically through the efforts of the Soviet side. We demanded that the Washington accord be strictly complied with. We agreed with Secretary of State Shultz—and I believe that this is one of the important results of the Moscow meeting—that a future accord on compliance with the ABM Treaty as an element of an overall comprehensive accord on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons will be fully based on the Washington understanding, I would even say, on the text of the joint accord reached at summit level there.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Thank you, and now my final question. As is known, during the Moscow talks regional problems, and in particular questions related to a settlement in Afghanistan, were discussed in greater depth and more specific detail. Is there hope that the coming round of Afghan-Pakistani talks in Geneva will be the final one in the light of the accords achieved on this matter between the Soviet and U.S. leaderships?

[Bessmertnykh] Yes, Afghanistan really did occupy a substantial position at the talks. Much attention was devoted to it by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev during his conversation with Shultz. Afghanistan, as well as the Near East and other regional matters, occupies a major position in our policies, and this aspect is correspondingly reflected in all our talks, particularly with the Americans. This is because the United States is to act with us as guarantors of the future accord on a settlement of the Afghan problem.

The main priority in the whole situation surrounding a settlement on Afghanistan is now to ensure that the next round of the Geneva talks between Afghanistan and Pakistan, through the intermediary of the UN assistant secretary general, begins on time. There are forces that do not want this to happen and are even acting to oppose it. I can even name these forces: They are the Pakistani authorities. The priority is thus to ensure that it starts on time and is concluded successfully.

We have managed to obtain an assurance from the U.S. side—and the secretary of state, as far as I understand, subsequently confirmed it publicly—to the effect that the United States would not hinder the normal progress of the Geneva process and the next round of talks. Moreover, the United States is to help to make this round of talks the final one. This means that a final, as

yet unagreed, document should be agreed. And if these documents are signed by 15 March the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan will start on 15 May.

So, to sum up, I can say that overall, we now have definite hopes, based on the results of the Moscow talks with Shultz, that the Geneva round will end successfully, that the troop withdrawal will begin, and that internal affairs connected with the formation of a government in Afghanistan—a coalition government, I mean—will be sorted out by the Afghans themselves. Thus, an additional chance of the settlement around Afghanistan progressing successfully emerged as a result of the Moscow talks.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Thank you very much.

[Bessmertnykh] Thank you.

U.S. Media Coverage of Shultz Talks Assessed
PM241541 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Feb 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent L. Koryavin article: "On an Optimistic Note; U.S. Mass Media on Soviet-American Talks in Moscow"]

[Text] Washington—Since the very beginning of the new round of Soviet-American talks, the U.S. mass media have struck an optimistic note. This optimism was maintained right through to the end. The meetings and talks between Comrades M.S. Gorbachev and E.A. Shevardnadze and Secretary of State G. Shultz in Moscow occupied a prominent place in television broadcasts and in the American press.

The commentaries have mainly focused their attention on disarmament issues. The first inference is that the subject of disarmament currently dominates the agenda of the Soviet-American talks. If we analyze recent American press material, we can see that since the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles in Washington, arms control issues have, as it were, acquired an ongoing momentum.

This current feature differs from the practice of past decades, when newspaper and television coverage of Soviet-American relations emphasized secondary issues which had often been artificially created. They concealed the main, vitally important problem in relations between the two countries—disarmament—with a "dense veil of mistrust."

Now the results of the talks in Moscow are in the forefront. They are described as "encouraging" for the new stage in the disarmament process. This phrase is being emphasized in reviews by the leading U.S. television channels and given a prominent place in the press. Observers have stressed that the outcome of the talks in

Moscow has thrown an encouraging bridge to the Geneva talks. Most of the reviews emphasize the point that positive results are expected from the participants in the Geneva talks in the next month.

But at the same time, there is still a lot of mud being thrown at the current process of Soviet-American relations. The same old stereotypes are being used: A distorted picture of the Soviet attitude on the Afghanistan problem, the subject of human rights "violations," and the question of superiority in conventional weapons. Just recently a military maneuvers scenario was played out at Fort Irwin in California, during which the "Soviet side" emerged the victor over the "American side" in the tank, infantry, and artillery "battles".... "Extensive maneuvers in the desert are seriously raising the question of the U.S. Army's combat capability"—this is the kind of headline now covering the front pages of American newspapers.

The main attention, however, is being focused on seeking solutions in the disarmament process. Observers are underlining the following theory. With the development of progress in this area the chances of Congress ratifying the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles will be increased. This will provide a new incentive to conclude the next treaty: On a 50 percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons.

Turkatenko Reports Shultz Departure for Mideast
LD251239 Moscow TASS in English 1048 GMT
25 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 25 TASS—TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

Today U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz set out on a tour of the Middle East. A State Department spokesman announced that Mr Shultz would visit Israel, Jordan, Syria, and Egypt. The spokesman declined to give any details of the aims of the trip and only said that he "will be visiting all countries that are immediately involved in the peace process."

Judging by U.S. press reports, the U.S. Administration feels increasing concern over the stormy developments in the Israel-Occupied Arab territories. Troops and tanks have been thrown to suppress people's action against the occupation. Is Washington really worried by Israeli occupiers' outrages? It is, to a certain extent. The White House recently advised the Israeli Armed Forces to limit themselves to the use of rubber bullets when dispersing demonstrations in the occupied territories.

The U.S. Administration is actually uneasy about quite different problems. The reprisals by the Israeli military have given rise to wrath and indignation among the entire international community and with new urgency raised the question of the need to terminate the Israeli

occupation as soon as possible and to grant the people of Palestine the right to self-determination and to the establishment of a state of their own on their age-old lands.

There have appeared reports indicating that the trip of Shultz is aimed first of all at helping to play down the wave of indignation and wrath over the actions of Israel, the U.S. 'strategic ally' and if only somehow to take the strain off the atmosphere.

THE WASHINGTON TIMES newspaper, close to the U.S. Administration, writes that Shultz intends to promise Arab countries U.S. assistance in establishing a certain 'confederation' of the Palestinians with the Kingdom of Jordan but at the same time to assure Israel that the United States by no means intends to seek its withdrawal from the occupied lands to within the borders of 1967 as well as to reaffirm 'guarantees' of the prevention of the establishment of a Palestinian state. Shultz also intends to try to revive the 'Camp-David process', i.e. to promote direct bilateral talks between Israel and individual Arab countries.

At times, there were hints in Washington officials' pronouncements at the desirability of convening 'in future' an international Middle East conference under the U.N. auspices. However, such hints are reduced to nought by the U.S. stubborn unwillingness to see the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as well as the Soviet Union, which is a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, among equal participants in such a conference.

Shultz himself stated shortly before his trip to the Middle East that he wanted to find out "the substance of the dispute" between Israel, on the one hand, and Arab countries and the Palestinians, on the other. He also voiced hope that during his talks in the Middle East there might arise some 'variations' which would help to find a way out of the impasse.

The leaders of Egypt and Jordan reaffirmed their stand that any talks between Israel and Arab countries are possible only within the framework of an international Middle East peace conference.

The role of 'an honest broker' in the Middle East is hardly possible without taking the opinion of Arab states into account.

Pogodin Views Shultz Middle East Tour
LD241629 Moscow World Service in English
1410 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Aleksandr Pogodin commentary]

[Text] The United States Secretary of State George Shultz has begun his tour of several Middle East countries. Aleksandr Pogodin has this comment:

Judging from statements by the state secretary himself, he has little hope that his mission will be a success. As he told a journalist, too many treat his tour with scepticism. There are, as it seems, enough reasons for that. The thing is that the American plan of a peace settlement in the Middle East that George Shultz has in his portfolio is inconsistent. It fails to take the interests of all the parties concerned into account. The plan lays an accent on intermediate measures and steps arousing no principled objections, but all these measures can yield results only within the framework of an all-embracing settlement of the Middle East issue.

The realistic way leading to it is the convocation of an international conference on the Middle East under the auspices of the United Nations and with the participation of all the parties concerned, including representatives of the Palestinian people and the permanent Security Council members. This is the stand that the Soviet Union has been steadily upholding. In this context the United States and Israel often accuse the Soviet Union of failing to show flexibility and claim that the Soviet Union's approach is virtually the main stumbling block in the way of a settlement. We'd like to remind our listeners at this point that the Soviet Union's approach is shared by the Arab countries, the Palestinian organizations, the European Community, and by most other countries.

As for the American concept of establishing peace in the Middle East, it arouses doubts. The American state secretary, as you may see, realizes this. It's hard to tell now what the results of the state secretary's current Middle East tour will be. During the recent talks in Moscow between the General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and the Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze on the Soviet side and the Secretary of State George Shultz on the American side, it was agreed that the exchange of opinions would continue after the state secretary completed his Middle East tour.

Vasilyev Comments on Shultz Middle East Visit
LD242049 Moscow TASS in English 1853 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 24 TASS—TASS Commentator Grigoriy Vasilyev writes:

The coming visit of U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz to the Middle East will be a waste of time if he limits himself to the effort to impose on the Arabs the idea of so-called "administrative autonomy" for the Palestinian population of the Israel-occupied territories, said Secretary General of the League of Arab States Chedli Klibi. He said there are no supporters for such ideas in the Arab world after the Palestinian Arabs rose against the Israeli occupiers.

The statement by Chedli Klibi fully reflects the attitudes in the Arab capitals now that a high representative of the U.S. Administration is to visit the Middle East. The recent visit to the area by U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Richard Murphy showed convincingly that Washington remains on pro-Israeli positions and stubbornly insists on a slightly touched up version of the bankrupt Camp David deal, that it has no intention of taking into consideration lawful and unquestionable rights of the Palestinian Arab People to national self-determination and creations of its own independent state. The United States virtually showed the unwillingness to contribute to an early and just settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

An attempt to impose an idea of "limited self-government" on the Palestinians on the West Bank and Gaza Strip looks particularly awkward now that the population of these areas launched an uprising against the abominable regime of the Israeli occupation, the uprising unprecedented for scope and boldness. The will of the rebels is not to be broken by bloody terror and brutalities of the punitive forces that daily kill peaceful unarmed people—women, children, the aged. Vicious crimes of the Zionists evoked profound indignation, anger and grief of all who visited the occupied territories of late, evoked protests of broad circles of the international public.

The urgency of a Middle East settlement is clearly confirmed. Developments show that it can be achieved not on the basis of old diplomatic [words indistinct] of American emissaries, but only through convening a full-fledged representative international conference with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the PLO, as well as the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council.

Arms Control Report Sent to Congress
LD250941 Moscow TASS in English 0859 GMT
25 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 25 TASS—The White House on Wednesday sent to Congress an annual report compiled by the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It pays much attention to the review of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations which led to the signing of the Treaty on Eliminating Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles.

"The INF Treaty constitutes a breakthrough in verification, the most far-reaching in the history of arms control, and should serve as a guide for other treaties to come", President Reagan says in a covering letter to Congress. The head of the administration takes note of the "political and economic advantages" of "effectively verifiable" arms reduction agreements for the United States' security and welfare.

The report also contains information on the ongoing negotiations in Geneva on a 50 per cent cut in the arsenals of strategic offensive armaments and other information on the activity of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Senate Continues Hearings on INF Treaty
LD241746 Moscow TASS in English 1709 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 24 TASS—Hearings on the INF Treaty continued on Tuesday in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and in the Senate Committee on Armed Services. Former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, Senator Jesse Helms and U.S. negotiator at Geneva on intermediate-range nuclear arms Maynard Glitman spoke at the hearings.

Addressing members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Henry Kissinger pointed to the need to ratify the INF Treaty to confirm, as he said, the United States role as a world power. He noted that the elimination of medium-range and shorter-range missiles is an accomplished fact and suits internal political interests of Europe. Kissinger said that the refusal to ratify the treaty or the advancement of terms which would necessitate the resumption of the talks on the INF Treaty would lead to a crisis in the Atlantic alliance. But while calling for the ratification of the treaty, the former secretary of state asserted that it would allegedly lead to the growth of the military vulnerability of Western Europe, as well as to its political and psychological vulnerability.

Speaking at the hearings, Senator Jesse Helms, who is one of the fiercest opponents of the treaty, called for the refusal to ratify it. He asserted that no causes can justify the ratification.

During the hearings in the Senate Armed Services Committee, Maynard Glitman dwelt at length on the course of the talks on the INF Treaty. Answering questions from senators he said that the treaty will not interfere with the United States efforts to render military aid to the allies in NATO. The treaty does not prohibit the transfer of technology, Glitman said.

In an interview to the UPI news agency, Senator David Boren, chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, where closed door hearings on the INF Treaty are held, expressed the conviction that the treaty will be verifiable.

Senator Byrd Speaks in Favor of INF Treaty
LD250555 Moscow TASS in English 0527 GMT
25 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 25 TASS—Robert Byrd, the leader of the Democratic majority in the United States Senate, spoke in the Senate Foreign Relations

Committee on Wednesday at hearings concerning ratification of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

He spoke out in favour of ratifying the treaty, and stated the need to introduce an amendment which would prevent the administration from changing the interpretation of the treaty's provisions in future. Such a proposal had been put forward earlier by some senators in view of the attempt of the White House one-sidedly to resort to the so-called 'broad interpretation' of the ABM Treaty.

At the same time the leader of the democrats came out in favour of keeping nuclear weapons in Europe and upgrading the nuclear and conventional arms of the United States and NATO.

Portugal's Silva Discusses Airbases With Reagan
LD251156 Moscow TASS in English 1028 GMT
25 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 25 TASS—Prime Minister Anibal Cavaco Silva of Portugal, who is on an official visit in the United States, remarked following his meeting with President Reagan on Wednesday that Lisbon intended to reconsider the U.S.-Portuguese agreement which ensures an unimpeded access for the United States to the Lajes strategic base on the Azores.

Judging by the prime minister's pronouncements, Portugal will insist on Washington's meeting its commitments under the agreement. At the talks in Washington the Portuguese prime minister voiced discontent and disappointment over the fact that the United States had virtually departed from fulfilling the accords reached at the talks in 1983. At that time Washington made a promise to grant Portugal more than 200 million dollars worth of economic aid in exchange for the maintenance of the big U.S. military base on the Azores.

However, as the Associated Press news agency points out, U.S. aid in the current year accounted for only slightly more than a half of the promised amount.

U.S., Israel Gain From 'Brain Drain'
PM241305 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
14 Feb 88 p 3

[Article by Novosti's B. Antonov: "The Brain Drain: Those Who Are Conducting the Campaign Organizing Emigration From the USSR and Why"]

[Text] The question of increasing the number of people leaving the Soviet Union for the United States and Israel, which Washington gives pride of place to in its dialogue with Moscow, is motivated not so much by humanitarian considerations as selfish ones. As Mikhail Gorbachev observed in his NBC interview, the United States has met half its requirements for mathematicians

through Soviet immigrants. Such a drain on intellectual resources and manpower enriches the United States and its strategic ally, Israel, while causing considerable harm to the Soviet Union.

The material damage caused by the Chernobyl catastrophe is put at R2 billion. But the losses occasioned by this exodus of people, in whose incitement the United States is involved, beats that figure several times over. The collection of statistics entitled "Immigrant Scientists and Engineers," which is published in Washington, shows that on average 10,000 chemists, physicists, mathematicians, biologists, and other specialists in areas central to the scientific and technical revolution take up residence in the United States each year. Immigrants make up one-fifth of all scientists and engineers working in the United States.

According to data from the London School of Economics, the United States, thanks to immigrants, saves 4 billion dollars a year just on the cost of training scientific and technical cadres, while Professor K. Nyuland [name as published] of Washington considers the sum involved to be no less than 5 billion. Computer technology is a typical example. In the eighties demand for specialists in this field has risen dramatically, increasing by 22 percent annually. It is met by foreigners, including former Soviet citizens.

An appendix to the compilation "Jews in the Soviet Union," published in Paris by the Zionist Federation of France, points out that there were already 15,000 engineers and 10,000 doctors from the Soviet Union working in Israel by the beginning of the eighties. That figure has now doubled. According to UNESCO, it costs 46,000 dollars to train such a specialist, while he earns his employers around 250,000 dollars in profit for every 10 years he works. This brain drain thus brings billions in profit. It is no wonder that issues connected with it have become a matter of state importance for Israel and the United States, which give them pride of place.

Special U.S. Congressional hearings in October 1987 examined how the federal government works with "Eastern Bloc" immigrants. It was noted that roughly 100,000 people from the USSR have settled in the United States since 1970 and that the figure for Israel is twice as large. Many speakers—among whom figured the CIA director and 20 other intelligence staffers—said that, apart from everything else, immigrants were invaluable to American espionage.

"They bring us an enormous amount of information about the policy, armed forces, economy, and national security of the Soviet Union that is very valuable for our defense," said Max Kampelman, chairman of the CIA-controlled Freedom House, an organization that works with immigrants.

In his speech, Senator Sam Nunn said that the incitement of Soviet citizens to emigrate should be carried out with even more determination and energy and that those who have come to the West from behind the "Iron Curtain" should primarily be involved in this agitation.

The draining of intellectual resources and manpower is carried out under the cover of the "reunification of families" slogan. Some 680,000 invitations, most of them false, coming from nonexistent, self-styled relatives, have been sent to the Soviet Union. It is no secret that those who sign such invitations in Israel are paid a fee in dollars. People are duped by material goods. The firms MYELA [name as published], Dinerman and Co., and others send free parcels to numerous people, each parcel containing items worth up to 1,000 dollars. They want to persuade people in this way that heaven on earth, where things are free, awaits them abroad.

All this expenditure is repaid with interest. American General George Keegan, who worked in USAF intelligence, once stated in an interview in THE JERUSALEM POST that for each dollar spent in the form of aid to Israel the United States receives from it in return various services worth 1,000 dollars.

Several radio stations engage in agitation and issue appeals to resettle. Tens of thousands of publicity videos about the Western and Israeli way of life, books, prospectuses, and brochures are sent out. Agitators and emissaries come to the Soviet Union posing as tourists. They recruit assistants and bring in large sums of money for purposes of bribery. Through their own selfish interests the organizers of the "brain drain" are impeding Western leaders' political and business contacts with the Soviet Union, holding back the solution of crucial questions of war and peace that are of utmost importance to all mankind.

Briefs

Canadian Sports Cooperation

Calgary February 20 TASS—The USSR State Committee for Sports and the Canadian Ministry for Physical Culture and Sports have reached agreement here to extend till 1992 the memorandum on sports cooperation between the two countries. It was pointed out that the sports contacts between the Soviet Union and Canada developed successfully under a similar document signed in 1984, and it was emphasized that cooperation in sports accorded with the policy of goodneighbourly relations. The existing Soviet-Canadian program in the field of sports provides for exchanges in various sports: ice hockey, swimming, gymnastics, figure skating, tennis, and so on. At the close of the document signing ceremony Marat Gramov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Sports, and Otto Jelinek, Canadian minister of state for physical culture and sports, made brief statements in which they positively evaluated the

already achieved results, voicing confidence that cooperation in the field of sports would continue to develop successfully. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0725 GMT 20 Feb 88 LD]

Near East & South Asia

Pakistan Criticized for Geneva Talks Stance

PRAVDA: Pakistan 'Torpedoing' Talks
LD241736 Moscow TASS in English 1706 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 24 TASS—In its February 25 issue the newspaper PRAVDA published an article by Yu. Knyazev entitled "Islamabad's Strange Pirouettes":

"With hope and optimism the international public is turning its eyes to Geneva where the Afghan-Pakistani talks, conducted under the auspices of the United Nations since 1982, are to resume shortly. A breakthrough may happen there. Real roads for this are paved in the statements by Mikhail Gorbachev and the President of the Republic of Afghanistan Najibullah.

"The leaders of many countries belonging to different socio-political systems have displayed realism in understanding the exceptional, it can be said historic importance of the provisions contained in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement on Afghanistan. This statement clearly and precisely indicates not only how to solve the long-ripe Afghan problem but also outlines concrete steps to liquidate other regional conflicts as well.

"Understanding of the importance, novelty, responsibility and unique favourableness of the situation for signing the Geneva accords is noted also in the Nonaligned Movement—this was stated in particular by the chairman of the movement, President of Zimbabwe Robert Mugabe—in countries of the Islamic Conference Organisation, and in the whole world.

"The signing of the Geneva accords and the withdrawal on their basis of Soviet troops from Afghanistan will solve the external aspects of the Afghan problem. But this, naturally, will create the necessary conditions for solving its other aspects as well.

"So the green light has been switched on for the Afghan and Pakistani delegations that are going to Geneva.

"How are those on whom the success of the Geneva talks depends behaving in the new situation?"

"The president of the Republic of Afghanistan has announced that he has given clear directives to his delegation to sign the documents. The Soviet Union and the United States agree to be guarantors of these accords. This was said also during George Shultz's stay in Moscow.

"And what about Pakistan?"

"Something strange is happening there. The Pakistani Administration has started performing odd political pirouettes and impudently made virtually an about turn from its former stand. 'New' proposals actually not only distorting the essence of the Geneva mandate of the talks but also totally blocking them are now streaming out of Islamabad. Now the Pakistanis no longer regard the timeframe and schedule of the withdrawal of Soviet troops as the main issue for a settlement. Now this is no longer so important in the opinion of the Pakistanis. What is important now, it is stated in Islamabad, is to replace the present government in Kabul.

"And nothing short of that. What an appetite has appeared.

"As a 'weighty argument' it is contended in particular that the refugees from Afghanistan supposedly will never agree to the Najibullah government to remain in power in Afghanistan. Also being urgently formulated is the thesis that the signing of the agreements in Geneva in conditions of sharp differences and hostility among the main opposition groupings 'will benefit only the Najibullah government'. And since that is the case then the more so this government should be removed—by the USSR, as they in Islamabad dream.

"Ambassadors of Moslem countries accredited in Islamabad are being urgently summoned to Pakistan's Foreign Ministry where they are being acquainted at length 'with the obstacles that are now arising on the road to settling the Afghan problem'.

"Pakistan's State Minister of Foreign Affairs Zain Noorani is also devoting much effort and energy to publicising these 'arguments' which have appeared so suddenly. He left urgently on a foreign tour of the United States, Britain, China, Saudi Arabia and several other countries. According to him this trip is determined by the need of urgent consultations with friendly countries before the Pakistani-Afghan talks begin in Geneva on March 2.

"Incoming information, in particular from Washington, London and Beijing, shows that the Pakistani representative had persistently tried to secure the support of 'interested countries' for 'Pakistan's new initiatives' which in practice simply mean torpedoing the Geneva process and the Afghan settlement as a whole.

"In effect the Pakistanis are trying to turn the Geneva process into a sort of hostage of the terms of creating in Afghanistan a government suitable to Pakistan, that is into a means for continuing their flagrant interference in the internal affairs of that sovereign state.

"The Pakistani leadership has been repeatedly and firmly told by the Soviet side that it was up to the Afghans themselves to form a platform of national reconciliation that would enable representatives of most

diverse groups of the Afghan population to take part in a coalition agreement. Neither Moscow, nor Washington, nor Islamabad, nor any other capital should claim to form such a government. And the timeframe of forming such a government should not influence and the more so delay the time of the signing of the Geneva accords. For this would mean procrastinating the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

"As to the successful completion of the Geneva process, in which all countries and peoples are interested, first of all Pakistan itself, only good will and a realistic approach are needed. And it is exactly this that the world public now expects of Pakistan.

"It is necessary for common sense to prevail. The undeclared war in Afghanistan can and must be stopped already this year.

"I would not want to think that there are countries and leaders who would act counter to the movement of the peoples towards peace and assume the unseemly mission of torpedoing the Geneva talks".

Afghans Demand 'Realistic Stand'

*LD241956 Moscow TASS in English 1731 GMT
24 Feb 88*

[Text] Kabul February 24 TASS—The Afghan public is riveting attention, as before, on settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. Meetings and assemblies are under way all over the country, expressing full support for the statements of the leaders of the USSR and Afghanistan. The Afghan people approves of the statements made by Mikhail Gorbachev and Najibullah on political settlement of the Afghanistan situation and demands that the Government of Pakistan should take a realistic stand at the Geneva negotiations, said at a meeting in Kabul Chairman of the Traders Trade Union Nasrat Khan Afridi.

We highly appreciate friendship with the great Soviet people who rendered us inestimable support and assistance in repelling armed aggression from outside, said Habibulla Akab, secretary of the journalists' union of the Herat Province. The memory of the courageous Soviet servicemen-internationalists shall ever remain in our hearts, he said.

All genuine Moslems and patriots of Afghanistan hope that the Governments of Pakistan and Iran will make an active contribution to putting an end to interference and to bringing the long-expected peace to the land of Afghanistan, said Mawlawi Fasil Rahman, chairman of the administration for Islamic and Waqf affairs of the Laghman Province, highly appraising the statements of the leaders of the two countries.

Afghan Minister on Coalition

*LD241447 Moscow TASS in English 1403 GMT
24 Feb 88*

[Text] Moscow February 24 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev's statement giving the schedule for the return of the Soviet troops home paves the ground towards the settlement of the Afghanistan problem, said Sulayman La'eq, Afghan minister of nationalities and tribal affairs, a creative writer and UNESCO prize laureate.

The Soviet and Afghan leadership, he said in an interview with the newspaper MOSCOW NEWS, agree that a large part of the troops be returned home already at the first stage. The ball is now in the court of the Pakistani side. Unfortunately, the latest pronouncements by the Pakistani political leaders are indicative of their intention to try and torpedo the Geneva process. Now Pakistan sets as its condition for the signing of these agreements "a replacement of the Kabul regime". We will not allow anybody to dictate what power and rule be established in the country, the minister said.

The national reconciliation policy pursued in Afghanistan, he continued, is based on the historical traditions of the Afghan people and the principles of Islam. Wishing to see their homeland an independent and non-aligned state, most of the Afghan tribes declare their support for the national reconciliation process. We propose more than 20 posts in the coalition government to representatives of opposition forces. We are prepared for a broad dialogue with them, S. La'eq emphasized.

The statement by Mikhail Gorbachev and the address by President Najibullah on Afghan television are bold steps dictated by the interests of peace and national reconciliation in Afghanistan. Now it is time to make a step towards the Afghans, who found themselves, for different reasons, on the opposite sides of the barricades. Much also depends on those who are trying to pose for their sympathizers—I bear in mind Washington and Islamabad. We would wish to believe that the statements made in those capitals about the wish for peace be matched with concrete actions, the minister said.

Feigned 'Concern' for Refugees

*LD251555 Moscow TASS in English 1527 GMT
25 Feb 88*

[Text] Moscow February 25 TASS—By TASS commentator Valery Vavilov:

Mikhail Gorbachev's statement on Afghanistan, which has cleared the way to an early peaceful settlement of the military conflict in Afghanistan, has been described as an "ultimatum" by Pakistani Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Zain Noorani.

He claimed that the statement did not contain anything new, except a promise to begin the Soviet troop withdrawal from May 15, and so could not ensure a peaceful settlement of the Afghan crisis.

Noorani explained the "ultimatum" charge by the fact that the Soviet proposal links the Soviet troop withdrawal to guarantees of foreign non-interference in the domestic affairs of a sovereign state.

Having brushed aside its own perennial demands for the Soviet troop pullout and for setting a date and timeframe for this process, described by Islamabad as a "key" to untying the Afghan knot, the Pakistani minister now offers a different "key".

He believes that before the Soviet troop withdrawal it is essential to replace the present government in Kabul. Feigning concern for Afghan refugees, he alleges also that they won't come back unless proper conditions are created, which, he says, can only emerge after the removal of Najibullah and the forming of a new Afghan government.

Islamabad's new posture has stimulated the activity of anti-government groups entrenched in Pakistan. The alliance of seven such organizations at a conference in Peshawar has worked out a comprehensive structure for a transitional government in Afghanistan.

This "structure", of course, leaves no room for "Kabul communists".

Alliance leader Yunus Khalis said that as long as the government in Kabul continued to include even a single communist, it would be facing resistance on the part of the Mujahidin.

Supreme authority, in keeping with the alliance's idea, would be vested in a Grand Council to include the leaders of the seven.

It is such a government in Afghanistan that the Pakistani minister apparently dreams about in his support for the anti-government groups. An official spokesman for the Pakistani Foreign Ministry hailed the proposed "structure" as a positive step.

The issue of the Afghan Government is an internal matter to be decided by the Afghan people themselves and the Afghans will be able themselves, without prompting from anybody, be it Islamabad, Washington or Moscow, to decide which kind of government they need.

Islamabad's "new initiatives" and its attempts to "replace the present government" of Afghanistan by Mujahidin puppets only demonstrate a striving to torpedo Geneva talks and delay the Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan.

To go away from concluding the Geneva process now would be tantamount to scuttling the entire Afghan settlement and it is hard to predict the consequences such a decision could have.

Islamabad appears to be afraid of the Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan as after the situation regarding that country is settled, it will evidently lose a substantial part of U.S. military-economic aid and backing from the overseas patrons.

But is it in the interest of the Pakistani people themselves to continue the confrontation?

Polyakov Discusses Recent Mideast Tour

U.S. Ideas 'Lack Consistency'

LD241421 Moscow TASS in English 1355 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 24 TASS—"The situation in the Middle East, especially in connection with the mass uprising of Palestinians in Israeli occupied Arab territories, confirms once again the need of speedily attaining a Middle East settlement by way of convening an international conference", Vladimir Polyakov, head of the Directorate of Middle East and North African Countries of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, told a press briefing here today. He returned on Tuesday from a tour of several countries of the region.

"All Arab countries drawn into the conflict are unanimous that only such a conference can open the road to such a settlement", he said. "And no partial or interim decisions can help here. They will only further complicate the matter if they are taken outside the context of a comprehensive Middle East settlement and outside the framework of the conference".

"The latest ideas expressed by the United States were dealt with to this or that extent during the conversations that I had during my trip", Vladimir Polyakov said. "Judging by what the Americans themselves tell the Arabs about them, these ideas on the whole are yet insufficiently thought out. They also lack consistency. But the main thing that they lack is observance of the principle of taking into account the interests of all sides involved in the Middle East conflict".

"It is believed in the Arab world", Vladimir Polyakov said further, "that the U.S. actions are dictated solely by desire to take the sting out of the Palestinian protests and help Israel extricate itself from the difficult situation in which it has found itself as a result of its unlawful and inhuman actions against Palestinians".

"The American concept, if it can be called so, gives rise to doubts everywhere", the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said. "For the administrative autonomy which is being suggested for the Palestinians of the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip within the

framework of this concept is by no means a solution of the Palestinian problem. This problem cannot be solved without the full-fledged participation of the PLO, the sole lawful representative of the Palestinian people".

"The new American ideas clearly reveal the old line of keeping the PLO out of the peace process and the solution of the Palestinian problem", Polyakov said. "Our contacts in the Middle East show that probably not a single Arab state can accept this".

"The situation in the Middle East determines the urgency and need of practical actions", Vladimir Polyakov stressed. "What is needed is serious intervention by the entire international community and first of all the United Nations Security Council. A threat both to peace and to human rights, the rights of a whole people, the Palestinian people, exists in the Middle East and it is the Security Council's duty to eliminate this threat. The sooner it begins practical work to convene the international conference the smaller will this threat be".

Describes Saudi Talks

LD241606 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 24 TASS—"My trip to Saudi Arabia has been a first visit by a Soviet official to that country in the past fifty years," Vladimir Polyakov, head of the Middle East and North Africa Directorate at the USSR Foreign Ministry, told a briefing here today.

He returned to Moscow from a tour of several countries in the region on Tuesday.

The Saudi side, Polyakov said, seemed to have appreciated my mission of conveying a verbal message from Mikhail Gorbachev to the Saudi king.

The message was conveyed to the crown prince, first deputy prime minister and commander of the National Guard, 'Abdallah ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz Al Sa'ud.

A very interesting conversation was held. It passed in an atmosphere of goodwill and mutual respect.

The Foreign Ministry official observed that meetings had also been held with Saudi Foreign Minister Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal. In the meetings the sides had a thorough exchange of views on all issues of mutual interest.

Gorbachev's verbal message singled out three issues, Polyakov said. They were: Middle East settlement and convocation of an international conference, the Iran-Iraq war, and Afghanistan.

The Saudi leadership welcomed the USSR's February 9 political decision on the timetable for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. "As we understood it," Polyakov noted, "Saudi Arabia also favours the earliest conclusion of Afghan-Pakistani agreements in Geneva."

Saudi Arabia, like the Soviet Union, resolutely backed international efforts at implementing Resolution 598 of the U.N. Security Council which contained a well-considered platform for ending the Iran-Iraq war and settling the conflict by political means.

The Saudi leaders clearly and unequivocally came out in support of the earliest convocation of an international conference on the Middle East with a view to attaining universal settlement.

They emphasized that one could speak of a fair and lasting peace in the Middle East only on condition of exercising the right of the Palestinian people to national self-determination.

"The recent trip to convey Mikhail Gorbachev's verbal message showed that contacts and political dialogue on all issues of mutual interest are developing," Polyakov stressed in conclusion.

Israel Intensifies Security for Shultz Visit

LD251735 Moscow TASS in English 1631 GMT
25 Feb 88

[Text] Damascus February 25 TASS—The arrival of U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz to Jerusalem is being marked by the sharp heightening of tension.

Extra troops were sent into the city in the past two days. More than 1,500 Israeli Army officers alone have been transferred there.

The streets in Jerusalem, especially its central part and eastern (Arab) districts, are being patrolled by the Army. Document checkups are conducted everywhere as the troops set up road blocks in all major thoroughfares of the city.

An official military spokesman admitted that "preventive" arrests were being conducted among the Arab population.

The strict security precautions, however, failed to stop the Palestinians protesting against the U.S. state secretary's visit. Palestinian national flags have been hoisted on many houses since morning. Anti-Israeli and anti-American demonstrations and clashes between Palestinians and Israeli invaders flared up in the city.

Jerusalem remains virtually sealed off from the rest of the world. A curfew has been clamped down in all Palestinian populated localities and refugee camps around the city.

According to reports reaching here, similar measures have been adopted against the Arab population in Hebron, Nablus and Gaza Strip.

Israeli soldiers today killed an 18-year-old Palestinian, 'Isam Abu Khalifah, as they opened fire on demonstrators protesting against Israeli occupation in the Palestinian camp of Janin.

Roundtable Discussion on Palestinian 'Uprising'

JN231507 [Editorial Report] Kuwait AL-ANBA' in Arabic on 18 February publishes on page 24 a 4,000-word report on a roundtable discussion organized by the paper in Moscow on "The Palestinian Uprising—Results and Horizons." The participants in the discussion are: Professor Igor Blishchenko, deputy chairman of the Association of Soviet Jurists; Dr Aleksandr Smironov, deputy chairman of the Middle East Section of the Soviet news agency Novosti; and Andrey Vdovin, chief of the Palestine Section at the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The speakers begin by alluding to Israel's violation of human rights in the occupied Arab territories, noting that the association of international jurists has set up a committee to determine the Israeli rulers' "international criminal responsibility" with regard to the crimes committed against the Palestinian people. The speakers also respond to questions on Soviet Jewish emigration, formation of a Palestinian government-in-exile, and other issues.

Commenting on the uprising, Professor Blishchenko says: "The Palestinian uprising raises before juristic public opinion and its international organizations a primary issue, among other issues and questions; namely, the international criminal responsibility of the Israeli rulers and the oppressive organs which carry out Israeli policy and commit crimes against the Palestinian Arab people, especially children, women, and old people. This calls for measures that go beyond denunciation and condemnation." Vdovin adds: "The uprising has also affirmed that expediting a peaceful settlement in the Middle East has become an urgent necessity that cannot tolerate any further delay, and that the only option in this settlement is the convocation of an international peace conference." Smironov comments: "The Arabs should exploit the opportunity now and not tomorrow. They should utilize all means so the uprising can achieve its legitimate objectives."

Official Praises Ties With Kuwait, Riyadh
LD221201 Kuwait KUNA in Arabic 1014 GMT
22 Feb 88

[Excerpts] Moscow, 22 Feb (KUNA)—A Soviet Foreign Ministry official, Oleg Peresypkin, has hailed Soviet-Kuwaiti relations, which have been developing successfully for 25 years. He praised Kuwait's willingness to exchange views on international issues.

The rector of the Soviet Diplomatic Academy stated in an interview with KUNA that by 11 March, half a century will have elapsed since the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Kuwait.

Peresypkin added that "the decision of the Kuwaiti leadership to establish diplomatic relations with Moscow was brave and farsighted in view of the events of the that period." He pointed out that "mass uprisings against the monarchical regimes in Egypt, Iraq, and the PDRY were used as evidence by imperialist propaganda of the Kremlin's interference in the affairs of Arab states."

The Soviet official went on to say that "the Kuwaiti leadership was not duped by these anti-Soviet allegations. Furthermore, His Highness Amir Jabir al-Ahmad al-Sabah, who was at the time deputy prime minister and minister of finance and industry, visited Moscow and had talks with the Soviet leadership, which culminated in the signature of a bilateral agreement on cooperation in the fields of economy, technology, and culture."

Mr Peresypkin noted that Kuwait adopts either identical or similar positions to those of the Soviet Union vis-a-vis a number of important international issues. He pointed to Kuwait's blessing of the U.S.-Soviet Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, and its call for finding acceptable solutions which will serve international security and peace.

The Soviet diplomat indicated that cooperation between both countries has expanded and become more comprehensive. He expressed his country's belief in the possibility of finding more ways to bolster Soviet-Kuwaiti relations and cooperation in all fields.

On the occasion of Kuwait's 27th anniversary, Mr Peresypkin expressed his congratulations to the Kuwaiti people, wishing it prosperity and tranquility and a speedy peace in the region. [passage omitted]

As for the Iraq-Iran war, he said that Moscow is continuing its policy aimed at ending this war through working in conjunction with the two parties to the conflict. He said that "despite all this, we should say to our Arab friends that granting military concessions to the United States, which Washington is trying to secure from the Gulf states, will, in our opinion, increase tension in the Gulf region." [passage omitted]

Assessing Soviet-Saudi relations in the light of the recent contacts that took place between both countries, Peresypkin said that "the interest with which Soviet officials welcomed the Saudi foreign minister, Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal, does not stem only from general Soviet policy, but was also due to the recent activity in the Middle East".

He added, however, that Soviet officials will not waste an appropriate opportunity to discuss the issue of bilateral relations with the Saudi foreign minister." He pointed to the developing trade negotiations and cooperation between Moscow and Riyadh.

Peresypkin ended his interview saying that "the visit by Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal to Moscow and the message of the custodian of the two holy mosques to the Soviet leader provided an opportunity for better understanding of the stances of both countries on various matters, and created a new and suitable atmosphere for bolstering cooperation and understanding between the two countries."

Geology Minister Receives PDRY Envoy
*EA242139 Aden Domestic Service in Arabic 1500 GMT
24 Feb 88*

[Text] Comrade Kozlovskiy, USSR minister of geology, has affirmed that relations of cooperation in the oil and minerals prospecting between the Soviet Union and Democratic Yemen are constantly improving, and that this cooperation will now rise to a higher level as one of the fruits of the friendship and firm relations between the two parties and governments. This was said today in the comrade minister's meeting with brother Dr Ahmad 'Abdallah 'Abd al-Ilah, member of the Central Committee and Democratic Yemen's ambassador in Moscow.

East Europe

Further on Gromyko Delegation in Budapest

Meets With Nemeth

*LD232246 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 2027 GMT 23 Feb 88*

[Text] Budapest, 23 Feb (TASS)—Talks took place here today in the parliament building between A.A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, and Karoly Nemeth, MSZMP Central Committee Politburo member and presidium of the Hungarian People's Republic chairman.

The sides conducted an in-depth exchange of views on topical problems of socialist construction in the USSR and the Hungarian People's Republic and on the wide range of bilateral cooperation. Most important international questions of mutual interest were also discussed.

A.A. Gromyko talked about the course of restructuring in the Soviet Union and about how the large-scale revolutionary transformations that are being implemented in various spheres of life in Soviet society. His information about the results of the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum, which took place a few days ago, was listened to with great interest. The speech

at the plenum by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, he said, was rich with new ideas and has been received by our party as guidance to action in the sphere of ideology at the present stage of restructuring.

A.A. Gromyko noted: We are satiating the program of restructuring with concrete demands, so the party and the people should believe in its well-founded and reliable nature. A number of laws have been adopted to create the conditions in which restructuring will be implemented. The most important of them is the Law on the State Enterprise. Although quite a short period of time has passed since it went into force, it is nonetheless already revealing itself positively. The law on individual labor activity is important. It is also in action but it is not yet meeting with the necessary understanding everywhere. With that aim—in the name of restructuring—a law is also being elaborated on cooperation, which will apply not only to consumer but also to production cooperation. As a whole we are confidently traveling on the right road.

K. Nemeth familiarized the Soviet side with the implementation of the decisions of the latest plenum of the MSZMP Central Committee and Hungarian National Assembly session which provide for the achievement of the socioeconomic stabilization of Hungarian society and the creation of preconditions for its subsequent dynamic development.

Both sides stressed the significance of efforts being undertaken in the Soviet Union and Hungary in the name of resolving the tasks of the present stage of socialist construction and the mobilization of the creative energy of the working people. In this connection, A.A. Gromyko and K. Nemeth singled out the importance of the profound study and creative use of the experience of how the mechanism of sovereignty of the people works in the two countries. They talked about the need to study processes relating to further improving legislation, accelerating the work of local authorities and public organizations, as well as drawing working people into running the state on the basis of broad democracy.

The sides noted with satisfaction the fruitful nature of Soviet-Hungarian cooperation in the political, economic, and humanitarian spheres. It is developing consistently and progressively on the basis of the accords reached during meetings between M.S. Gorbachev and J. Kadar, in the interests of the peoples of the two countries. During the talks both sides stressed that as the authority of bodies of people's power in the Soviet Union and Hungary grows and their range of powers expands their interaction in the system of bilateral relations will naturally grow.

The desire was noted of the Soviet and Hungarian peoples to deepen and further improve links in the sphere of science, education, and culture, use new forms of mutual contacts between working people, and step up contacts along various lines for these purposes.

Topical issues of world politics were examined. During this, the sides confirmed the complete unity of views in the assessment of the present situation in Europe and in the world as a whole, and expressed the conviction that a restructuring of international relations should be conducted in the direction of forming an all-embracing system of international peace and security.

A.A. Gromyko and K. Nemeth stressed the determining significance, for the destinies of peace, of the antiwar, peaceloving foreign policy course of the USSR, Hungary, and other fraternal socialist countries. Their far-reaching proposals, directed at halting the arms race, disarmament, and saving mankind from the threat of war, were aimed at consolidating international security and trust.

Both sides expressed the conviction that on the world arena a consolidation of positive trends was to be noted and this would to a decisive degree depend on the earliest ratification of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, on further progress in the direction of nuclear disarmament, and especially on conclusion of the treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons with the condition of the observance of the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed, and not departing from it during the course of the agreed term. All this would help to move forward in the direction of the creation of a nuclear-free, non-violent world.

A.A. Gromyko and K. Nemeth pointed to the increased responsibility of the parliaments of all countries for the preservation of peace on earth and the development of international cooperation. They spoke in favor of the comprehensive development of contacts among parliamentarians. Special significance in our time was being gained by closer relations among parliaments of socialist countries on a bilateral and multilateral basis.

The sides expressed the firm resolve to continue strengthening the unity and cohesion of the countries of the socialist community, to improve their cooperation within the framework of the Warsaw Pact, and to deepen their interaction in the international arena in the interests of strengthening universal peace and security.

The talks passed in a warm, comradely atmosphere, typical of the fraternal relations between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Hungary.

Taking part in the talks on the Soviet side were persons officially accompanying A.A. Gromyko during his visit to the Hungarian People's Republic.

Taking part in the talks on the Hungarian side were:

- Janos Peter, Hungarian State Assembly deputy chairman;
- Imre Katona, MSZMP Presidium secretary;

— Jozef Marjai, Hungarian Council of Ministers chairman;

— Jozef Bogner, Institute of World Economics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences director;

— Tibor Czerez, Hungarian Writers' Union chairman;

— Miklos Barity, Hungarian People's Republic deputy foreign minister; and

— Sandor Rajnai, ambassador of the Hungarian People's Republic to the USSR.

Gromyko, Nemeth Dinner Speeches

PM241417 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Feb 88
Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under the headline "USSR and Hungary—Friendship, Collaboration, and Mutual Ties"]

[Text] K. Nemeth, MSZMP Politburo Central Committee member and Hungarian People's Republic Presidium chairman gave a dinner today in the parliament building in honor of A.A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, and his wife.

Officials accompanying the guest on his visit also attended. Present on the Hungarian side were members of the MSZMP Central Committee Politburo K. Grosz, Council of Ministers chairman, M. Ovari, MSZMP Central Committee secretary, C. Hamori, MSZMP Central Committee first secretary; Presidium of the Hungarian People's Republic members; and other officials.

K. Nemeth delivered a speech at the dinner. He said:

Dear Comrade Gromyko!

Dear Guests!

Dear Comrades!

On behalf of the MSZMP Central Committee, the Hungarian Peoples Republic Presidium, the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian Peoples Republic, my fellow countrymen present here, my wife and myself personally, I welcome with a feeling of great respect Comrade Gromyko, his esteemed wife, and all our Soviet guests. The visits and meetings of our parties and states leaders, and the exchange of experience and views being carried out between them play an important role in strengthening our friendship and cooperation.

It is a great honor for us that Comrade Gromyko's visit to Hungary is his first official trip abroad as USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman. Here in Budapest, this evening, I recall with pleasure our last meeting in Moscow, which took place during the internationally significant celebration of the 70th anniversary of the

Great October Socialist Revolution. I can say with satisfaction that the profound analysis your fraternal party has given of the revolution and the path which has been traversed, and of their lessons, which are also relevant for today, was met with understanding by the Hungarian public.

Dear Comrade Gromyko!

Your visit is taking place at a time when we are mobilizing forces toward the resolution of acute economic problems and the implementation of the decisions of the Central Committee July 1987 Plenum and the government's working program, which was approved by the State Assembly. A vital requirement is flexible adaptation—with which we have obviously been late—to the changed domestic and international conditions of the building of socialism. The resolution of the tasks formulated in our program, which demand our full effort, presupposes a new way of thinking and active measures related to this thinking, and more highly qualified administration and execution of decisions. The interests of the further development of the country, the more rational use of our material and spiritual resources, and the provision of social guarantees to an equal degree require that we speed up the processes of transformation and consistent actions aimed at the all-around development of the mechanism for managing the national economy, the system of political institutions and socialist democracy. More than ever before we now need creative cohesion, labor, and the initiative of all those who care deeply about the fate of the motherland. The national unity now being renewed should serve the interests of the socialist development of society. This presupposes constructive dialogue and cooperation even with those who hold views other than the party on certain questions of socialist construction. It is without doubt that the main guarantee for overcoming our present difficulties and for the creation of the foundation of our future is national cohesion and the desire for active effort.

One should neither decrease nor dramatize the problems that await solution. If we stop to think about the road covered, the results achieved by the people's efforts, we have no grounds for faint-heartedness. Nor have we grounds to hush up our blunders and mistakes and the existing economic and social tensions. The situation requires glasnost, a realistic analysis; it requires adapting our work to the changing conditions of social development. In this spirit we are preparing for the forthcoming all-Hungarian party conference, which will take place in the first half of the current year.

Dear Comrade Gromyko!

Dear Comrades!

From the point of view of the attractiveness of socialism, its future, of decisive importance are the answers we will give to the new questions posed by life. The majority of the socialist countries, including Hungary, are looking

for solutions which meet their specific character, traditions, and conditions most of all. At the same time our intentions and aspirations are essentially one: In the interests of our peoples and social progress, we wish to make better, fuller use of the possibilities and advantages of the socialist system.

The renewal taking place in Soviet society has a decisive role in this historically significant process. Hungarian communists and the Hungarian people welcome and attentively and kindly follow the great and difficult work of restructuring. From the bottom of our hearts we wish great success to the Soviet people under the leadership of the Leninist party in resolving the complicated tasks of economic and social restructuring.

What is happening today in this sphere in the USSR has gone far beyond the bounds of one country. The new thinking and the policy of glasnost have also brought considerable results in the sphere of international relations. The USSR's initiatives and proposals, which we completely support, carry within them the possibility of a change for the better in international affairs, for the development of qualitatively new relations between countries with different social systems (and for replacing confrontation) with readiness for cooperation.

The initiatives of the Soviet Union, the joint efforts of the allied socialist countries, other manifestations of political realism in international affairs, and general concern made possible the signing of the first disarmament treaty, which is of historic importance. At the same time, we must realize also the fact that forces exist in the world who do not care for the strengthening process which is leading to a comprehensive strengthening of international peace and security.

We need to do everything to ensure that mutual and equal security is provided with a lower level of armaments in order for the world to advance along the path of disarmament, peace and cooperation and for this process not to be threatened by regional conflicts.

Dear Comrade Gromyko, we can state with satisfaction that Hungarian-Soviet relations are developing comprehensively and successfully.

A few days ago we marked the 40th anniversary of the first Hungarian-Soviet treaty on friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance. This treaty, in accordance with our ideas, the principles of internationalism, and the interests of our peoples, laid down new grounds for relations between our countries. All-round cooperation has developed between us in politics, the economy, culture, and science; and it is fitting to note the broadening of contacts between our citizens. No doubt there are still numerous unused reserves for our cooperation. We attach special significance to a more rapid movement in the formation of more modern cooperation, which has already begun, in the economy and science; in the setting up of direct ties between enterprises and

establishments in the two countries; and in the creation of joint enterprises. We ought to actively promote the expansion and strengthening of cooperation in all spheres between elected state bodies and local soviets.

Our cooperation has reliable prospects. The full unity of views and aspirations on all important issues of socialist construction and international life represent its firm foundation. We are interested in each other's successes, in mutual support of each other's efforts, and in implementing the programs for the renewal of the economic and social life of our countries. This spurs us on to further improve and enrich the content of our cooperation in all spheres.

I am confident your visit, dear Comrade Gromyko, in keeping with the joint purpose expressed in the course of our today's talks, will make a great contribution to the development and strengthening of Hungarian-Soviet relations.

Dear Comrades!

I am raising my glass to the friendship and cooperation between our parties and peoples, to the successes in our creative socialist work, to the strengthening of peace and security, to the health of Comrade Gromyko and his wife and all dear Soviet guests who are present here.

A.A. Gromyko then delivered a speech. He said:

Esteemed Comrade Nemeth!

Dear Hungarian friends!

Comrades!

First of all I would like to cordially thank the MSZMP Central Committee and the Hungarian People's Republic Presidium for the invitation to visit Hungary. I remember previous meetings on Hungarian soil very well.

Literally a couple of days ago both of our countries were marking a significant date: the 40th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the Soviet Union and Hungary. For more than 40 years the Soviet and Hungarian peoples have been traveling arm in arm along the road of socialist construction. From the bottom of our hearts we rejoice at the successes of our countries. Together we have overcome the difficulties encountered on the road and have come to help at a difficult time.

Considerable experience has been accumulated in creating a new society in the past decades. This is of particular value at this time, at the contemporary stage of the development of the Soviet Union, Hungary, and other countries of the socialist community.

The destiny of socialism on a historical scale depends to a large extent on how quickly and how effectively we will be able to meet the level of demands of the present stage from the position we have achieved. This is the only road our countries and people will continue to steadfastly follow.

The course of the CPSU formulated in the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and plenums of its Central Committee is permeated with a deep realization of this indisputable truth. Its aim is the complete restoration of the Leninist conception of socialism, the renewal of all aspects of life in Soviet society, and the adequate opening up of the humanist nature of our social system.

A key issue in our foreign policy, as you know, is essentially revolutionary restructuring, which is genuine, profound, and requires new approaches and new thinking. It is being resolved on the path of radical economic reform and the profound democratization of public life. The development of democracy and all its institutions and glasnost are imparting the necessary dynamism to the development of socialist society as well as allowing it to more fully use its potential.

At present, when we have explained more precisely what must be done and how, a new and even more important stage in restructuring is coming: It is essential to implement it deeply and broadly and make it an inalienable integral part of the practical work of the entire people.

I won't say that on this road everything is everywhere proceeding smoothly. We believe the positive processes in individual sections of our life are developing more slowly than we would like. Some things in the results of the development of the country's national economy last year don't fully satisfy us.

But, nevertheless, the main thing determining the position of the vast majority of Soviet people—and progress in the preparations for the 19th All-Union Party Conference convinces us of this once again—is the popular support for the ideas of restructuring, the belief in its success, the demand to advance steadily. As soon as people are imbued with a spirit of optimism, of confidence in the rightness of their cause, they start working and acting in social matters with fuller application, as is demanded by the new stage of development of Soviet society.

Our Hungarian friends have already acquainted themselves with the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum that took place the other day. We also spoke about this today during the talks, and quite a lot. Its decisions enrich the party and the entire Soviet people with ideas and with the setting of new tasks in the field of restructuring all spheres of life of Soviet society, and in the specific field of restructuring the entire system of education in the country. The plenum's decisions also enrich the Communists and all Soviet people with new approaches in ideological work. The tasks in this area

were defined precisely and with immense persuasiveness in the speech by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

Our party and the Soviet state consider restructuring in close connection with the processes taking place in fraternal socialist countries. We are striving to maintain at all levels a constructive and interested exchange of views with friends, are always ready to share our most innermost thoughts, and in our turn to voluntarily listen to their thoughts. With that aim, lively and very meaningful contacts, including at the highest levels, are being made between the fraternal countries.

Our conversations in Budapest once again confirm our unity of views on current fundamental problems and our readiness to further develop comprehensive cooperation. Indeed, although perhaps we use different terms for the processes that are underway in the Soviet Union and the Hungarian People's Republic, and our current concerns do not coincide in everything—that is natural. The essence of what is taking place, I think, is well expressed by a formula that is common to both countries: "More Socialism, More Democracy." This circumstance to a decisive extent defines the growing significance of Soviet-Hungarian cooperation in all fields.

Our cooperation must to the fullest extent meet the demands that have been put today on the agenda in the Soviet Union and in Hungary.

A sound foundation for this has been laid. First and foremost, we have in mind the accords reached during the course of the meetings between Comrades M.S. Gorbachev and J. Kadar, the regular contacts between politicians and statesmen of our countries, and the close ties between the CPSU and the Hungarian Socialist Worker's Party, state and government bodies, and public and mass organizations of the USSR and Hungary. Of course, their further expansion and deepening should continue to remain the subject of our special concern. We believe this meets our mutual interests.

Bilateral economic cooperation is the pivotal trend in the development of Soviet-Hungarian relations from the point of view of practical policy. On the whole, it is developing in a fruitful manner. But life constantly makes one sense the correctness of the expression: "He who stands still is actually going backward."

That is why it is important, without putting things to one side, to seek out and bring into play reserves to increase the effectiveness of economic interaction—especially as they are still very great. It is clear, for example, that broader scope for this is being opened up by the transformation of the economic mechanism in our countries, in the Soviet Union and in the Hungarian People's Republic.

It is no accident that a great deal is being said and written now about new forms of economic cooperation between socialist countries, about the establishment of joint enterprises, scientific research collectives, and international production associations and also the establishment of direct ties between economic units. Quite often you can hear diverging views about their prospects, ranging from enthusiastic to reserved assessments.

Naturally, when one is breaking new ground there are sometimes more problems than advantages. This is an established fact. After all, the beginning is often difficult. We even have a proverb to this effect which says: "The first step is the hardest." It is a good proverb.

I would also like to dwell on another problem. I have in mind the fuller utilization of the mechanism of people's power. This is of importance also for the enhancement of the efficiency of cooperation between our countries in specific spheres.

I believe complete mutual understanding reigns between us on this question. Both in the Soviet Union and in Hungary the task of the all-around development of socialist democracy is being tackled, the working people's participation in the process of management is broadening, its forms are becoming increasingly varied, the constitutional-legal system is being improved, the role of the supreme legislative bodies and of soviets of people's deputies at all levels in growing, and the activities of public organizations are becoming more vigorous.

It seems to me we can learn quite a lot from your experience in this sphere. In turn, I assume, some things that have been happening in the Soviet Union of late might be of interest to our Hungarian friends. The benefits from such reciprocal enrichment are obvious and mutual.

The growth of prestige and expansion of the competence of the organs of people's power in the Soviet Union and Hungary are a good reason for taking a new look at their role and place in the system of bilateral relations.

Might it not be a good idea, for instance, to examine key questions of our cooperation at sessions of the Standing Commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Hungarian National Assembly and to hear reports by leaders of the relevant ministries and departments?

Is it not possible for oblast and city soviets to make a more substantial contribution to the development of partnership relations and to encourage the establishment of direct businesslike ties between enterprises and labor collectives more actively?

Is it not a task of the soviets of people's deputies to promote the all-around development of cooperation in border areas?

Or take the humanitarian sphere. In the Soviet Union interest in the life of the Hungarian people is rising and this also applies to the interest in Hungary in the life of the peoples of the Land of the Soviets. Both Soviet and Hungarian people would like more information on this score, and that means the leaders of our mass media should give some thought to this. It is necessary to encourage this mutual attraction, to expand contacts between people in every way, to restructure the activities of friendship societies, and to promote studies of the Russian and Hungarian languages.

We have mutually complementing achievements in various spheres of science—hence it is necessary to further develop the mechanism of joint research and publications and the system of exchanges of post graduate, specialist, and other students.

We want to know more about each other's culture—therefore it is necessary to improve the whole multifaceted spectrum of cultural cooperation from Soviet and Hungarian culture festivals and the development of the activities of cultural and information centers to promoting personal contacts between the exponents of the arts.

In short, there is work as far as the eye can see. But it is noble work and a thankful task. All that is needed is a fresh and far-reaching look at problems and persistence and singlemindedness in resolving them. Both you, Hungarians, and we Soviets have every reason to claim that we possess these qualities.

Speaking in broad terms about international matters, I would like to note the closest interdependence and interconnection between the domestic policy of the Soviet state and its foreign policy course. This interconnection is obvious and firm. The renewal and development of our society is a powerful springboard for exerting a more intensive influence on the international atmosphere in the interests of ensuring universal peace and security, in the interests of socialism. Vice versa, our peace-loving foreign policy in the spirit of the new thinking creates more favorable conditions for the implementation of large-scale transformations in the country.

The experience of the last few years—the definite improvement in the international atmosphere, the progress which has emerged in certain spheres of international politics, and the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles—shows that people understand this interconnection in the strategy of socialism, that it is taken into account even far beyond the confines of our socialist community. This further increases the attractiveness of our peace-loving policy.

In conclusion allow me to thank you, esteemed Comrade Nemeth, and all the present Hungarian comrades, for your cordiality and warm reception and to wish fraternal

Hungary's working people much success in the implementation of their plans in the social and economic sphere, happiness, and prosperity.

May the indestructible friendship between our countries and peoples grow stronger!

The speeches of K. Nemeth and A.A. Gromyko were met with applause. The dinner passed in a warm, friendly atmosphere.

Gromyko Meets Kadar, Grosz
LD242102 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1935 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Text] Budapest, 24 Feb (TASS)—A meeting took place in Budapest on 24 February between A.A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, who is here on an official friendly visit, and Janos Kadar, MSZMP general secretary.

During the conversation, which took place in an atmosphere of friendship, mutual understanding, and unity of views characteristic of the relations between the two parties, states, and peoples, there was an exchange of views on topical questions of socialist construction and Soviet-Hungarian relations, and on key problems of the international situation.

A.A. Gromyko and J. Kadar expressed satisfaction with the onward development of bilateral relations, and noted the importance of the close cooperation between the CPSU and the MSZMP, the Soviet Union and Hungary in all spheres. The mutual desire to continue to strengthen fraternal friendship and multifaceted Soviet-Hungarian cooperation was confirmed.

During the discussion of international issues, the need was stressed for the further stepping-up of efforts by the Soviet Union, Hungary and other socialist countries, and all peace-loving forces in the struggle to restrain the arms race and set up a comprehensive system of universal peace and security.

On the same day, A.A. Gromyko met with Karoly Grosz, MSZMP Central Committee Politburo member and the Hungarian People's Republic Council of Ministers chairman.

During the conversation, K. Grosz talked of the progress made in implementing the government's program for socioeconomic stabilization and development.

Top priority in the Soviet Union, A.A. Gromyko emphasized, is given to relations with the socialist countries and to the practical realization of agreements between

the leaders of the fraternal parties regarding the intensification of multilateral and bilateral interaction. Like our Hungarian comrades, we are convinced that our economic and scientific-technical ties have good prospects.

The conversation took place in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

In the first half of the day, A.A. Gromyko laid wreaths at the monument to the Hungarian heroes who fell in the fight for the freedom and independence of the motherland, at the monument to V.I. Lenin, and at the monument to the liberating Soviet troops who perished in battle against the Hitlerite fascists for the emancipation of Hungary.

Further on Meeting

PM251207 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Feb 88
Second Edition pp 1, 4

[TASS report: "Commonality of Views, Strengthening Collaboration"]

[Text] Budapest, 24 Feb—A meeting took place in Budapest today between A.A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, who is here on an official friendly visit, and J. Kadar, MSZMP general secretary.

A.A. Gromyko conveyed cordial greetings from M.S. Gorbachev to J. Kadar. For his part J. Kadar conveyed best wishes from the Hungarian people and himself to the CPSU Central Committee general secretary.

During the talk, which took place in the atmosphere of friendship, mutual understanding, and unity of views traditional for relations between the two parties, states, and peoples, there was an exchange of opinions on topical questions of socialist building and Soviet-Hungarian relations and key problems of the international situation.

A.A. Gromyko described the Soviet people's selfless labor to fulfill the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and subsequent party Central Committee plenums which put forward a broad program for the revolutionary renewal of Soviet society and defined the basic guidelines of the radical economic reform and further democratization of the country's life.

Special attention was paid to the results of the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum which gave a comprehensive analysis of the new stage of restructuring, defined the program for its ideological backup, and examined questions of intensifying the reform which has been initiated in the national education system. There was also a discussion of the progress of preparation for

the 19th All-Union Party Conference, designed to assess what has been achieved in the restructuring process and to outline the next tasks for its further progress both laterally and in depth.

J. Kadar said that the visit of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman is an organic part of the entire system of Soviet-Hungarian relations. Ties at summit level are very necessary. They incorporate two functions: They provide an opportunity for holding regular talks at summit level, and they show the whole world the friendship between the Soviet Union and Hungary.

Having assessed highly the work which has been launched in the USSR to accelerate socioeconomic development, J. Kadar noted that restructuring is of great importance for the destiny of world socialism. He provided information on the MSZMP's activity in implementing the program of socioeconomic stabilization, on the basic avenues for the further improvement of the political system in the country, and on preparation for the all-Hungary party conference.

A.A. Gromyko and J. Kadar expressed satisfaction at the advance of bilateral relations and noted the importance of close collaboration between the CPSU and the MSZMP and the Soviet Union and Hungary in all fields. There was confirmation of the mutual desire to continue to strengthen fraternal friendship and multifaceted Soviet-Hungarian cooperation.

During the survey of international problems the need was emphasized for the further buildup of the efforts of the Soviet Union, Hungary, the other socialist countries, and all peace-loving forces in the struggle to curb the arms race and to create an all-embracing system of international peace and security.

A.A. Gromyko described the progress of the examination in the USSR Supreme Soviet of the treaty between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, which has been passed on for ratification, and about U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz' recent visit to Moscow.

The Soviet Union believes that the process of this treaty's ratification will be successfully completed. During the talks in Moscow the U.S. representative said the same thing on the United States' behalf.

There is no doubt that ratification will be a major step along the path of reducing nuclear weapons. The next task is the elaboration of a treaty on a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive armaments under the conditions of the conservation of the ABM Treaty. After the ratification of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the talks on the new range of questions connected with the reduction of strategic offensive armaments will proceed in a more favorable atmosphere.

The Soviet Union will occupy a principled line on the question of eliminating nuclear weapons. It is pursuing its policy while sensing the support of the fraternal socialist countries and their parties.

At the same time A.A. Gromyko drew attention to the complex situation which can be observed among the United States' NATO allies. On the one hand, they welcome the signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty, yet on the other they are adopting the pose of onlookers: It is as though neither Britain nor France had their own nuclear weapons. Some representatives of those countries' ruling circles are even going so far as to claim that Western Europe needs to be "compensated" for the weapons which the United States must eliminate in Western Europe.

We state categorically, A.A. Gromyko said, that it is in vain that these politicians are trying to use some kind of "guile" and are claiming that with the destruction of one class of weapons it is necessary to "redress the balance" by building up armaments of other types and classes. If this line prevails, it could complicate all business in the international arena. Indeed the statements of British and French spokesmen claiming that these countries' nuclear weapons should not be the subject of talks are grounds for suspicion in themselves. After all, these statements are being made in a period when the process of nuclear disarmament of the Soviet Union and the United States is under way.

For the Soviet leadership, for our country, the struggle for disarmament and the defense of the cause of peace is a subject of daily concern.

J. Kadar assessed highly the Soviet-U.S. treaty and the Soviet leadership's steps aimed at easing international tension and consolidating the atmosphere of constructive dialogue and cooperation.

A.A. Gromyko dwelled on the Soviet Union's policy with regard to regional conflicts. There was an examination of the situation in Central America, where the United States is trying to be the arbiter of what happens in Nicaragua and is thus creating dangerous tension. The Soviet Union, he continued, is acting vigorously to extinguish the Iran-Iraq war, which is senseless in nature and is bringing enormous losses and destruction to both countries taking part in the conflict. There was also an examination of the situation in the Near East, where the uprising of the Arab people of Palestine on the territories occupied by Israel has been continuing for many weeks. The key to the problem's solution is the convening of an international conference on the Near East with the participation of all interested sides, including the five permanent members of the UN Security Council and representatives of the PLO. Africa is in turmoil: With its policy of aggression the racist RSA is creating a hotbed of tension in the south of the continent.

The participants in the talks unanimously expressed the conviction that under the impact of the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries the positive trends outlined in the development of the international situation will be consolidated and the transition to the path of the practical implementation of the ideas of a nuclear-free, nonviolent world will be effected. K. Nemeth, president of the Hungarian Presidential Council; S. Rajnai, Hungarian ambassador to the USSR; and B.I. Stukalin, USSR ambassador to Hungary, were present at the talk.

On the same day A.A. Gromyko met with Karoly Grosz, MSZMP Central Committee member and Hungarian Council of Ministers chairman.

During the talk K. Grosz described the progress of the implementation of the government program of socioeconomic stabilization and development. He set forth a number of ideas on ways of further deepening Soviet-Hungarian economic and scientific-technical ties and improving the mechanism of multilateral cooperation within the CEMA framework.

In turn A.A. Gromyko stressed that the Soviet Union is paying priority attention to relations with the socialist countries and the practical implementation of the accords between the fraternal parties' leaders on questions of intensifying multilateral and bilateral collaboration. Like the Hungarian comrades, we are convinced that our economic and scientific-technical ties have good prospects.

Major changes are taking place in the Soviet economy. With the entry into force of the Law on the State Enterprise (association) enterprises producing 60 percent of industrial output have transferred to full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self financing. At the same time the positive trends here have so far only begun to appear.

Further transformations will also demand the improvement of legislation in the field of the electoral system, the trade unions, and the position of young people to ensure optimum conditions for the development of democracy and the assertion of glasnost and openness in all spheres of society's life. The creative energy of the deputies of our soviets and of the entire Soviet people are aimed in this direction.

A.A. Gromyko described in detail the CPSU Central Committee February (1988) Plenum, which comprehensively examined questions of restructuring in the secondary and higher education system in the USSR. It is a question of ensuring that not only that there are no uneducated people in our country but also that a person who has completed instruction in a secondary or higher educational establishment can immediately go to work at a modern production facility without requiring special training. It is also a case of creating a material base at

educational establishments which meets with present-day requirements. In addition the plenum keenly raised the question of ensuring that the system of scientific research institutes is closely interwoven with the system of universities and educational institutes.

The second question examined attentively at the plenum was the question of cadres' ideological training. It was set forth in the speech delivered by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary. Cadres should not only have a precise and in-depth knowledge of the current tasks of restructuring on their specific sector but should also know how to think in large categories. The aims in the ideological field are to teach people to be aware of the stage of development through which we are passing. The party and entire Soviet people welcomed M.S. Gorbachev's speech with approval.

The talk took place in a warm, friendly atmosphere.

In the morning A.A. Gromyko laid a wreath at the monument to the Hungarian heroes who died in the struggle for their motherland's freedom and independence.

A wreath laying ceremony at the monument to the leader of the world proletariat—V.I. Lenin—was held on Parade Square.

A.A. Gromyko laid a wreath on Liberty Square at the monument to the Soviet servicemen-liberators who died in the fighting against the Hitlerite fascists for Hungary's liberation.

The people officially accompanying A.A. Gromyko on his visit to Hungary, I. Katona, secretary of the Hungarian Presidential Council, and P. Ivanyi, Budapest City Council chairman, attended the laying of wreaths.

Talks took place today between A.K. Antonov, USSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman, and Hungarian Council of Ministers Deputy Chairmen P. Medgyessy and J. Marjai. The sides exchanged opinions on questions of the further development of economic cooperation and particularly on the extensive introduction of new forms of economic collaboration between the two countries.

Antonov, Voss News Conference

LD242153 Moscow TASS in English 2140 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Budapest February 24 TASS—A press conference was held here today on the occasion of the official friendly visit to the Hungarian People's Republic of member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Andrey Gromyko.

Answering journalists' questions, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Aleksey Antonov noted the good condition of Soviet-Hungarian economic relations which have meanwhile huge reserves for further development. It is necessary to work jointly over increasing the technological standard and quality of mutually-supplied products, to perfect the practice of cooperation between the two countries, to resolve questions linked with the impact of differences in the economic mechanisms of the USSR and the Hungarian people's Republic on bilateral economic relations.

In the course of perestroika, which is under way in the Soviet Union, the work in the sphere of relations between nations has been largely stepped up, said chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet Avgust Voss, answering questions.

To the question on interference of U.S. mass media into affairs of Baltic republics he answered that these attempts proved to be futile, were a failure. The evidence of that is the assessment of that interference given by the peoples of the baltic republics themselves.

Speaking of the role of interparliamentary relations in improving the international situation, Avgust Voss pointed to broad and many-sided contacts of the USSR Supreme Soviet with parliaments of many countries of the world. These contacts are a feasible contribution to consolidation of new political thinking, the struggle for peace, for an end to the arms race and for disarmament.

Latin America & Caribbean

CIA, Drug, Contra 'Criminal Network' Claimed

PM231215 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian

16 Feb 88 First Edition p 3

[Report by NOVOSTI correspondent M. Baklanov under the "Narcotics and Politics" rubric: "Reporters on Minefield"—first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction]

[Text] Panama—The mornings are cold in San Jose. Shivering, they waited, trying to keep warm by talking. The reporter's eternal occupation is waiting. But sometimes you do not know in advance whether there is any point in doing so. On this occasion Orion Pastora, the brother of "Commandante Zero," had scheduled a meeting at the Irasu [name as published] hotel to secretly transport journalists across the San Juan river to the Nicaraguan side. While they are waiting for the unusual news conference and—as it soon transpires—their fate, a few words about the events preceding that May day are transmitted to the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA editorial office by a NOVOSTI correspondent.

"Commandante Zero"—that was the name given to Eden Pastora after the Sandinistas' famous operation to seize hostages in Managua's National Palace. A year

before the Nicaraguan Revolution, a photograph circulated the world showing "Commandante Zero," his armed raised in the victory salute, entering an aircraft. The partisans, together with the liberated hostages of Somoza's dictatorship, were flying to Panama. That was the start of the decisive stage of the rebel struggle. Pastora was to hold the post of deputy defense minister in the revolutionary government.

New photographs of the legendary commandant would be published in newspapers, and there would be dozens of interviews and news conferences. He liked news conferences.

Then the terrible news: Pastora had turned traitor.

The former "Commandante Zero" created a counterrevolutionary grouping on Costa Rican territory which carried out attacks on Nicaragua's southern departments. Pastora's grouping was to suffer one defeat after another. Having quarreled with the other contra leaders and finding no common language with the CIA, Pastora was to lay down his arms and leave the armed struggle. When I was in Costa Rica, the former rebel was living in isolation on the Pacific coast, devoting his time to fishing....

But let's return to May 1984. Orion Pastora rolled up to the hotel in a jeep, and the usual wrangling about who would go began. U.S. journalist Tony Avirgan was immediately told there would be no room for him. The contras did not trust him, believing him to be a "leftist." Tony and his wife Martha got into their own automobile and followed the jeep as uninvited guests.

Pastora had organized the news conference in La Penca, on a scrap of Nicaraguan land, for one purpose—proving that he could seize an "important" bridgehead on the border river of San Juan and was controlling part of Nicaraguan territory. The explosion that interrupted his speech gave a different dimension to this trivial event.

Pastora, slightly wounded, was immediately evacuated. The journalists were forgotten. Four of them died in agony before the eyes of the others, who were helpless and had no possibility of assisting their comrades. Some of those who were lucky enough to survive were to remain crippled.

Tony was in the hospital for 2 months. During this time, the official investigation was concluded. Incidentally, the main suspect was Avirgan himself; not on the basis of facts, but for ideological motives he was accused of planting the bomb. As he lay in the American hospital and read the newspapers, he reconstructed in his memory all the details of 30 May 1984. Some things had begun to be clarified. But there was still a great deal to clear up.

Soon Tony and Martha began their own investigation.

"American organizations engaged in the defense of journalists' rights asked us to investigate the case," Tony says. "It seemed to us that it would all be quite simple and take a couple of weeks. Who could have supposed that we would become so involved in the story?"

"It is important that you should understand we began the investigation without prejudices, with an open mind, as they say. Who needed to get rid of Eden Pastora? We realized that his enemies 'from the right' and 'from the left' could be interested. The rightists wanted his death because Pastora was too independent and refused to join other contras groupings. The leftists, that is the Sandinistas, had every grounds for hating him as a traitor. So we did not intend to discard either possibility. But the trail we found led obviously to the right. Indeed, we could have no idea how far it would lead us. Having begun the investigation of a specific incident—the attempted assassination in La Penca—we revealed an entire criminal network in which the contras, Americans of Cuban origin, arms and drugs traffickers, and the U.S. special services are taking part. Essentially, long before 'Irangate' broke, we had found its main link."

The preliminary investigation alone took 2 years. They questioned over 200 people in various countries. They sought the specific culprits in the assassination attempt.

At one stage, it seemed to Tony that their investigation was on the wrong track. They were constantly encountering information about narcotics. At first they did not pay any special attention because they did not see the link between cocaine traffickers and political terrorism. But soon they began to receive threats from the smugglers, and that put them on their guard. Their lives were being threatened by people connected with the drugs business who did not, however, at first glance have anything in common with the La Penca assassination attempt. A little later threats began to come from known terrorists involved in the attempted assassination of Pastora. They were frightened by the possibility that the details would be made public.

"So we began to realize that it was not a case of two affairs. It was one and the same story."

An old story, according to Tony. In the early eighties, the CIA was working on the creation of a "southern front" for the contras on Costa Rican territory. They had constructed secret runways in the country's northern regions and bribed the local officials to look the other way. At the same time, conditions were created for unimpeded flights from the United States and back. The aim was to deliver weapons to the contras.

This structure was ideal for the cocaine suppliers. The "Medellin Cartel" (the name given to Colombia's largest organization, which controls 85 percent of the cocaine entering the United States) reacted instantly. The smugglers were particularly attracted by the arrival of a group of Cuban emigres in Costa Rica on a CIA mission. The

reporters succeeded in ascertaining that it was they, engaged in creating the contras' "southern front," who were simultaneously providing shipment points for cocaine trafficking.

It was to this "minefield" that the investigation of the assassination attempt in La Penca led Avirgan. "We now have evidence given under oath confirming the contras' link with the drugs business. Pilots (mainly Americans, but there is one Colombian, and they are all of extreme right-wing persuasions) who delivered weapons to Costa Rica told us they were unloaded at secret airfields in the north of the country. Then the aircraft were loaded with cocaine."

...May 1987. Exactly 3 years after the explosion in La Penca, the reporters were nearly blown up on a "mine" set by their secret enemies. On 14 May the journalists' secretary, the Costa Rican Carmen Araya [surname as published] was going to collect the mail on instructions from Tony. She was given notification of a parcel to be collected at the custom-house. At 1000 hours, as Carmen was leaving the custom-house building, she was surrounded by agents of the Costa Rican drug squad.

"The parcel contained a book. Someone had torn out the central pages and placed a packet of cocaine in the hiding place. There was also a letter addressed to me with a Nicaraguan return address. It thanked us for our work, allegedly under instructions from the Sandinistas. There was a signature: Nicaraguan Minister of the Interior Tomas Borge."

I have in front of me a cutting from the MIAMI HERALD. The photograph shows a round face with big features. A wrinkled forehead merges with a strong, bald skull. Folds of skin have also collected beneath the chin. Such is the appearance of this American millionaire living in north Costa Rica. He is John Hull. The caption says that Hull appropriated a substantial share of the funds allocated to help the contras. He was hired by the CIA and the U.S. National Security Council to organize and support the anti-Sandinistas' "southern front." The item was published 3 November 1987.

"John Hull," Tony says, "is a well-known figure in the U.S. intelligence world. He has wonderful cover: a retired businessman with an estate of 3,500 acres not far from the border with Nicaragua. He grows citrus fruit and has herds of cattle. And, moreover, an airport has been constructed on his land—absolutely legally. That this airport has been regularly used by aircraft delivering weapons for the contras to Costa Rica and taking drugs from Costa Rica for the U.S. black market is another matter. The present Costa Rican Government is disinclined to connive with this—in contrast to the former government. So John Hull cannot operate with the same freedom as before. But he remains a link, and a very important one, between the CIA and the drug mafia.

"Now about the story of the cocaine and letter sent to us. American gangsters use the term 'hit list.' That is when bandits draw up a list of their victims. Martha and I were among Hull's enemies, and we were on his list. He has a special account to settle with us ever since we proved Hull's direct participation in the organization of the La Penca explosion. We also proved that it was Hull who sent the parcel containing cocaine."

After their investigation, Tony and Martha had their own list. It contains 29 names, mainly of major U.S. officials (some of them have already retired) and contras ringleaders. The journalists filed a suit against them in Miami 2 years ago and are hoping to win.

This case is unprecedented, and in Costa Rica it is being called "the trial of the century." "We are aware of the difficulties," Tony explains. "After all, we intend to achieve the conviction of the people who are working or were working in the recent past for the U.S. Government with the aid of the U.S. legal system. All we have on our side is evidence of their guilt."

Nicaragua's Ortega on U.S. 'Humanitarian' Aid
LD240956 Moscow TASS in English 0920 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Managua February 24 TASS—President Daniel Ortega of the Republic of Nicaragua has described the plan to channel new funds to the gangs of Somoza followers under the pretext of "humanitarian assistance" as "gross interference in the affairs of Nicaragua and the violation of international laws".

In a talk with journalists he stressed that the United States makes attempts to use this term as a cover-up for its intention to go ahead with shipments of military hardware to the hired terrorists who commit gory crimes on the Nicaraguan land. Any kinds of aid to the contras should be cut off until a ceasefire agreement is reached in Nicaragua, the president said.

Argentina, Columbia Condemn Falkland Maneuvers
PM241619 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
24 Feb 88 First Edition p 3

[TASS reports under the general heading: "Argentina's Demand"]

[Text] Buenos Aires, 23 Feb—Argentina has demanded an emergency session of the OAS Permanent Council in connection with the British intention of holding military maneuvers on the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands. This has been announced by the Argentine Foreign Ministry.

The British military department is currently completing preparations for the large-scale military maneuvers due to begin in the south Atlantic on 7 March. The Argentine press points out that the maneuvers include the prompt transfer of troops, aviation, and other combat hardware

to the islands. Some 2,000 British troops are permanently stationed there at present. By the time the maneuvers begin, it is planned to transfer a further 5,000 soldiers there along with fighters, helicopters, and tanks.

Observers believe that the aim of the upcoming maneuvers is to demonstrate London's intention to concede nothing to the UN appeals to resolve the dispute with Argentina on sovereignty over the Falkland (Malvinas) islands by peaceful means.

Bogota, 23 Feb—The Colombian Government has resolutely condemned the British plan to conduct military maneuvers on the Falklands. In an official statement released here, the Colombian Government stresses that London's actions are contrary to the UN resolutions which call for the south Atlantic to be turned into a peace zone. The Colombian Government, the document points out, expresses the hope that the problems existing between Britain and Argentina will be resolved by political means.

Chilean Political Forces Comment on Plebiscite
PY231437 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2100 GMT
22 Feb 88

[Text] A call for the creation of a Committee for Free and Democratic Elections and for the People's Demands has been signed in the Netherlands by representatives of the Almeida- and Nunez-factions of the Socialist Party [PS] and the PCCh. The signatories have offered to unite all Chilean political forces represented in the Netherlands and all Netherland organizations and personalities who agree with the cause of the Chilean people. The document, signed by the Socialist Party of Chile, whose secretary general is Clodomiro Almeida; the PS, led by Ricardo Nunez; and the PCCh, is entitled, "Against the Fraudulent Process for the Legitimization of the Regime." Our correspondent in the Netherlands, Carlos Bao, defends the main aspects of the document:

The political path followed by the Chilean dictatorship demonstrates that the interests of the dominant classes and imperialism in our country are not well protected at this time, as long as they are administered by a political command supported only by the force of arms and the all-powerful will of a dictator. The plebiscite announced by the tyranny is nothing but an expression of the need of, and the attempt by, the financial and monopolistic bourgeoisie and transnational capital to lay down a new basis of apparent political legitimacy in order to continue their class domination. It is obvious that in a clean plebiscite, the tyranny would lose, as demonstrated by the total domination of the opposition in elections at unions, professional associations, universities, and in the most varied social sectors. Moreover, the rightist candidates in general have not even claimed to support the regime. The only way the dictatorship can win the plebiscite is to mount a gigantic electoral fraud, as in 1980. That is when the Constitution, that serves as the

alleged judicial foundation for this new parody of elections, came into being. That Constitution was not approved by the people because that plebiscite was not legitimate. Therefore, if a candidate of the tyranny wins this plebiscite amid weak denunciations of fraud and a poorly-mobilized opposition, as in 1980, the struggle for recovering democracy will have suffered a serious setback. On the other hand, if the opposition is capable of promoting a large mass mobilization to back popular demands and really free and democratic elections, our people will have made a move forward toward freedom. We must then do all we can to increase social mobilization in order to abort the plebiscite or go to the plebiscite with the people standing proud in struggle, so as to wage a great battle for democracy.

The national clamor for free and democratic elections is a just demand, a legitimate aspiration of the Chilean people, and a right that must be fully exercised.

Let no one be deceived. Pinochet and his illegitimate 1980 Constitution are the main obstacles for democracy because they do not allow the people to express their sovereignty and because they prevent free and democratic elections.

In order for the demand for free and democratic elections to become a real contribution in the struggle against the dictatorship it must be included in the people's demands for the restitution of their violated rights. There must be a social mobilization. There will be no free and democratic elections without a social mobilization.

This mobilization for free and democratic elections will end ideological exclusion and political proscription. It will end the National Security Council, the brutal human rights violations, and all the arbitrary articles of the 1980 Constitution.

The dictatorship needs to manipulate the Chilean people's electoral rights in order to survive. It must perpetrate a fraud against the people's sovereignty. It is the duty of all democratic forces to unite to defeat any fraud.

Our social mobilization for the people's demands and for free and democratic elections seeks to create the essential conditions of freedom in order to be able to hold free elections for president of the Republic, for a constituent assembly or national congress, and for municipal elections.

We reject the tyranny's political parties' law. We demand freedom for all the political parties so that they can organize themselves. We demand the termination of the ideological exclusion system imposed by the Pinochet constitution.

We are against his fraudulent plebiscite. We want democratic electoral courts. We want guaranteed and equal access to the media for all the political parties. We want

freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and the freedom to create unions. We want the right to vote for the Chileans abroad. We want Clodomiro Almeida and all the political prisoners to be released. We want the end of torture and exile.

**[Signed] Committee for Free and Democratic Elections
and for the People's Demands**

Political & Social

More on Demonstrations in Nagorno-Karabakh

Obkom First Secretary Replaced

PM251200 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Feb 88
Second Edition p 2

[TASS reports under the general heading: "Around Events in Nagorno-Karabakh"]

[Text] Baku, 24 Feb—A meeting of party activists was held in Baku today. It discussed urgent measures to improve the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region.

It was noted in the report by the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan Kyamran Bagirov and in the debate that in the past several days a part of the Armenian population in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic had made demands that Nagorno-Karabakh be included in the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic. Irresponsible, extremist elements provoked violations of public order.

The participants in the meeting were unanimous that the actions and demands directed at revising the existing national-territorial arrangement contradict the interests of the working people of the Azerbaijan and Armenian Soviet Socialist Republics and inflict damage to inter-ethnic relations.

The obtaining situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region, the speakers noted, became possible due to the passive wait-and-see attitude of the autonomous region's party and government bodies whose leadership had displayed a superficial approach to evaluating the obtaining situation and the existing sentiments. Neither have the republican bodies been up to the mark in this matter.

The meeting decided to direct the entire political and ideological influence at explaining the Leninist nationalities policy and its essence at the present stage. In all this work it is necessary to proceed from the premise that the nationalities question demands close and constant attention to national specificities and psychology and that due account should be given to the vital interests of working people.

Yerevan, 24 Feb—A meeting of party activists in the Armenian capital has considered urgent measures to normalize the situation in Yerevan in connection with developments in Nagorno-Karabakh and fulfillment of the CPSU Central Committee's resolution on this issue.

Karen Demirchyan, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Armenia, made a report.

The meeting approved and took as a guiding principle the CPSU Central Committee's resolution as the only correct one under the current conditions, and undertook to strictly implement it.

The special responsibility of the republic's party activists before the party and the people was stressed.

The meeting pointed out that party gorkoms and raykoms and primary party organizations should adopt resolute measures, guide the efforts to normalize the situation and broaden work in the masses and in work collectives on explaining the tasks stemming from the CPSU Central Committee's resolution.

Stepanakert 24 Feb—A meeting of party activists of the region agreed fully and completely with the appraisal of the CPSU Central Committee of the situation that formed in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region as serious.

The meeting notes that actions and demands aimed at the revision of the existing national-territorial structure of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region run counter to the interests of the working people of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic and the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, do damage to inter-ethnic relations and, unless responsible measures are taken now, might lead to unpredictable consequences and even to consequences difficult to remedy. All this has become possible as a result of calls of irresponsible persons and a passive stand of party and government bodies of the autonomous region.

The meeting of party activists deems it of fundamental importance that the party obkom, the Stepanakert gorkom, party raykoms and primary party organizations should use every means of political and ideological influence to explain the Leninist policy of nationalities, its essence at the present stage.

It is necessary to proceed in this work from the awareness of the fact that the nationalities question requires close and constant attention to national specific features, psychology, requires taking into consideration the vital interests of the working people.

Party organizations of the region, activists of the ideological institutions should launch broad work among the masses, in work collectives on questions stemming from the resolutions of the CPSU Central Committee, should make every working person understand that document so that the situation be normalized sooner.

Stepanakert, 24 Feb—A plenary meeting of the Nagorno-Karabakh Obkom was held here and studied an organizational question. The plenary meeting relieved Boris Kevorkov of his duties of first secretary and member of the obkom Bureau for shortcomings in his work.

Genrikh Pogosyan was elected first secretary of the Nagorno-Karabakh Obkom. His previous post was first deputy chairman of the regional soviet of people's deputies.

Pogosyan Biography

LD241630 Moscow TASS in English 1621 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Stepanakert February 24 TASS—An organisational question was studied here today by a plenary meeting of the Nagorno-Karabakh regional party committee. It elected Genrikh Pogosyan to the post of first secretary of the Nagorno-Karabakh regional party committee.

Genrikh Pogosyan, an Armenian, was born in 1931 in Stepanakert, in the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic. He joined the CPSU in 1961. After graduating from the Institute of Mechanising and Electrifying Agriculture in Moscow in 1955 he held a number of posts at enterprises in the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region. Pogosyan served as chairman of the Stepanakert City Soviet (mayor of Stepanakert). From 1979 to 1985 he was the director general of the Nagorno-Karabakh Production-Agrarian Amalgamation, while in 1985 he became first deputy chairman of the regional soviet of people's deputies and chairman of the agro-industrial committee of the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region.

'Sweeping Demonstrations'

NC241921 Yerevan International Service
in Arabic 1821 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Text] Sweeping demonstrations and popular meetings continue in the Armenian capital of Yerevan. The participants are voicing support for the decision made by the representatives of the people's parliament regarding the Karabakh region during the meeting held on 20 February. The decision calls on the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Republics of Azerbaijan and Armenia to secede the mountainous region of Karabakh in the Republic of Azerbaijan and attach it to the Armenian Republic.

The participants in the sweeping demonstrations and popular meetings (?made) statements calling on [word indistinct] leaderships in Moscow and Armenia to support the decision [word indistinct] to attach it to the Armenian SSR.

On the 1st day of the demonstration, the delegation representing the demonstrators received Karen Demirchyan, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Armenia; Grant Voskanyan, member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet in Armenia; and Fadey Sarkisyan, chairman of the ASSR Council of Ministers of Armenia. The meeting was attended by members of the [words indistinct]. They briefed the delegation on the issue.

On 22 February, Karen Demirchyan, first secretary of the Communist Party Central Committee, announced [words indistinct] concerning the mountainous region of Karabakh. The party organizations in the republic are holding meetings with worker and student circles to explain to them the essence of the party's national policy.

Meanwhile, demonstrations and popular meetings continue in Armenia. A meeting was held by party [word indistinct] yesterday. The conferees discussed the issue of returning the situation in Yerevan to normal. Tension prevailed due to the incidents over the issue of the Karabakh region. The conferees also discussed the adequate measures to implement the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee decision on this issue. Karen Demirchyan, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in Armenia made a statement during the meeting [words indistinct] a decision was made on the issue under discussion. The decision says: It is imperative to ask the CPSU Central Committee to conduct an in-depth study of the mountainous region of Karabakh during its preparation for the periodic CPSU Central Committee meeting which will be devoted to discussing national policy.

'Complicated Political Situation'

NC242057 Yerevan International Service
in Armenian 1855 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Text] Meetings have been held in Yerevan since last Saturday at which the participants continue to support the decision made on the Karabakh region by the representatives of the people's parliament during the 20 February 1988 meeting. That decision calls on the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Azerbaijan and Armenian Republics to cede the mountainous region of Karabakh in the Republic of Azerbaijan to the Armenian Republic.

Participants in the meetings have addressed statements and appeals to the leadership in the republic and in the union calling on them to assist in implementing the decision on ceding the mountainous region of Karabakh in the Republic of Azerbaijan to the Armenian Republic.

On the 1st day [of the meetings], representatives of the participants in the meetings were received by Karen Demirchyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee; Grant Voskanyan, chairman of the Presidium of the Armenian SSR [title as heard]; Fadey Sarkisyan, prime minister of the Armenian SSR; and members of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, who briefed the delegation on the issue.

On 22 February 1988, Karen Demirchyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, (?announced the ownership) of the mountainous region of Karabakh. The party organizations in the republic are presently meeting with (?members of collectives) and

student circles to explain the party's national policy and the essence of this policy in relation to decisions of the Central Committee of the Armenian SSR Communist Party.

[Words indistinct] the (?demands) made in the region's meetings and demonstrations (?reflect) the interests of the workers of both the Armenian and the Azerbaijan SSR's.

The Communists of Armenia, under this complicated political situation, call for a display of logic, (?orderly behavior), and [word indistinct] in order to prevent (?any incident) that may harm the international [words indistinct].

The meetings continue in Yerevan.

Dolgikh on 'Armenian Problem'
NC250913 Yerevan Domestic Service in Russian
0630 GMT 25 Feb 88

[From the review of KOMMUNIST]

[Text] The paper publishes the text of a speech delivered by Comrade Dolgikh, candidate member of the CPSU Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, entitled "The Armenian Problem." In part, it says the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh would be [words indistinct]. Mr Dolgikh called on all to show maturity and to restore the normal pace of life and labor in Yerevan and the Republic.

The paper reports that Comrades Dolgikh and [name indistinct] laid wreaths at [words indistinct], the tomb of the unknown soldier, and the monument to the victims of the 1915 genocide.

The paper also carried material on events in Nagorno-Karabakh. It reports on the meeting of the oblast party aktiv which (?discussed) fully the CPSU resolution on the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. It also reports on the meeting in Stepanakert of the Nagorno-Karabakh Party Obkom which examined organizational questions. For shortcomings and omissions in fulfilling his work, the plenum released Kevorkov from his duties as first secretary and member of the party obkom bureau. The former first deputy chairman of the oblast executive committee Pogosyan was elected first secretary of the Nagorno-Karabakh Party Obkom.

More Demonstrations Reported
AU251509 Paris AFP in English 1453 GMT
25 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow, Feb 25 (AFP)—Thousands of nationalists seeking the return to Armenia of a mountainous region ceded to neighbouring Azerbaijan held renewed demonstrations in the Armenian capital of Yerevan on Thursday, witnesses said.

The witnesses—travellers who arrived by plane here from Yerevan—said that the latest demonstrations were even bigger than those which had assembled around 200,000 people in the city centre on Wednesday.

They gave varying estimations of the numbers of people in the streets, from tens of thousands to half a million.

The autonomous region of Nagorno-Karabakh, where the predominantly Roman Catholic Armenians make up 80 per cent of the population of 160,000, was attached to Muslim-dominated Azerbaijan in 1923. Protests in the Armenian capital calling for the region's return to Armenia have continued for the last two weeks.

The travellers said that the protests, which originally were concentrated in the centre of Yerevan, had spread to the outskirts. They added that they had seen long lines of Armenians travelling on foot from neighbouring towns and villages to join in the demonstrations.

They also reported rumours of deaths in clashes between Armenians and Azerbaijanis in Nagorno-Karabakh. Bus services between Yerevan and Karabakh had been suspended.

Telephone lines between Yerevan and Moscow, which had functioned normally up to Wednesday, went dead on Thursday.

The unrest has already led to one major sacking—on Wednesday, the Communist Party leader of Nagorno-Karabakh for the last 15 years, Boris Kevorkov, was dismissed for "shortcomings in his work". He was replaced by fellow ethnic Armenian Genrick Pogosyan, who had been first deputy chairman of the regional assembly.

Politburo member Vladimir Dolgikh, one of four senior Kremlin officials sent to the region, appealed for calm on Armenian television on Wednesday. He assured the local population that the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh would be discussed at a forthcoming Central Committee meeting on nationality problems announced by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

Troops Deployed in Yerevan
AU251546 Paris AFP in English 1522 GMT
25 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow, Feb 25 (AFP)—Troops have been deployed in the centre of the Armenian capital of Yerevan, the scene of mass demonstrations by Armenian nationalists this week, a dissident source said here Thursday.

The source, quoting the Armenian militant Parour Airikian in Yerevan, said that truck loads of soldiers had arrived Wednesday evening. They were deployed Thursday around public buildings, and were on guard in the streets.

Armenians Killed in Karabakh

LD251607 Hamburg DPA in German 1511 GMT
25 Feb 88

[Excerpts] Moscow (DPA)—The situation in the Soviet Republic of Armenia has reportedly not calmed down. According to reports reaching Western correspondents in Moscow, tens of thousands of people have again demonstrated in Yerevan. [passage omitted]

According to the "Society for Threatened Peoples" in Goettingen, in the past few days four members of an Armenian ethnic group have lost their lives. The chairman of the society, Tilman Zuelch, said in Goettingen today that they were killed in attacks by the Azerbaijani populations in the mountain region of Karabakh. [passage omitted]

Correction to Moscow TV Report on Protests

The following corrections pertain to the item subheaded "Situation Outlined," published in the 24 February Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pp 37-38:

Page 37, column two, paragraph two, sentence two: ...review of the existing national-territorial structure contradicts... (providing omitted word)

Page 38, column one, paragraph one, only sentence: ...Leninist principles of the nationalities policy, the CPSU Central... (rewording)

Same page, column one, same sentence: ...the patriotic and internationalist feelings of the... (rewording)

Same page, column one, paragraph two, only sentence: ...necessary measures to normalize the present situation... (rewording)

Same page, column one, last paragraph, only sentence: ...the party and soviet bodies of the republics to normalize the... (rewording)

Same page, column one, same sentence: ...relating to Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, to ensure... (correcting name)

More on Estonian Independence Day Demonstration

20,000 Reportedly Take Part

AU251246 Paris AFP in English 1207 GMT
25 Feb 88

[Text] Stockholm, Feb 25 (AFP)—Between 15,000 and 20,000 Estonians defied a ban by the Soviet authorities Wednesday night to commemorate the short-lived existence of Estonia as an independent state between the two World Wars, Baltic exiles in Sweden said Thursday.

The rally in the streets of Tallinn, the Estonian capital was to celebrate the 70th anniversary of Estonia's accession to independence, according to spokesmen for the Stockholm-based Helsinki Baltic Group and the Committee for Aid to Political Prisoners in Estonia.

They said a "large number" of demonstrators gathered Wednesday evening outside Tallin city hall despite the presence of a heavy police contingent.

"Up to midnight, several thousand people continued to mass at various points in the city and refused to obey police orders to go home," the spokesmen said quoting eyewitness accounts.

The demonstrators chanted anti-Russian slogans and "Estonia for the Estonians" but there were no incidents, the spokesmen said.

Wreath-laying and poetry-reading ceremonies also took place in central Tallinn where a number of prominent nationalist militants were assigned to their homes, the exile groups said.

To prevent news of the demonstrations getting out, Soviet authorities decided to cut telephone links between Tallinn and Stockholm, but "reliable and convincing accounts reached us all the same," they said.

Estonia was proclaimed an independent state on February 24, 1918 but its independence was never recognised by the Soviet Union.

It remained independent until 1940 when it was annexed by Moscow along with Lithuania and Latvia.

On Tuesday, TASS news agency said Tallin city authorities had banned the independence day demonstration because of its "nationalist and extremist" nature.

But Soviet television did show a film of an officially-sponsored demonstration in Tallin in which it said workers, students and war veterans had "protested foreign interference" in Estonia. It said they had sent a message to the U.S. Congress protesting a U.S. request to let Estonians mark their independence day without official harassment.

Workers Protest U.S. Interference

LD241950 Moscow TASS in English 1846 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Tallinn February 24 TASS—Correspondent Arvo Laud writes:

The political eagerness with which American congressmen are again trying to rewrite the history of the peoples of the Soviet Baltic region proves their lack of knowledge of the subject at hand. This is the unanimous conclusion drawn by a big meeting of working people held in the

Estonian capital today. They expressed a strong protest against attempts by American law-makers to interfere in the internal affairs of their sovereign republic.

This time the American politicians chose February 24, 1918, the date of the proclamation of the Estonian bourgeois republic, as a pretext for their provocations. A statement addressed by the participants in the meeting to the United States Congress and President Ronald Reagan says that "the Estonian people conducts the chronicle of its revolutionary struggle from October 1917, the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. And in summer of 1940 it again confirmed its historic choice in favour of socialism".

The meeting was held in Victory Square in Tallinn. It was there that in June 1940 the working people of Estonia demanded that power be handed over to the people. In 1941 battalions of Estonian patriots marched through this square to engage the fascist invaders. This square also remembers May 9, 1945 when the Soviet people celebrated victory over Hitler's fascism. And today the voice of protest of the Estonian capital's working people sounded in the square. They qualified as utter cynicism that attempts by the American congressmen to portray the terror unleashed in 1918 by the German occupationists and the bourgeois nationalists against the Estonian people as a triumph of "independence".

Dmitriy Kuzmin, a worker and veteran member of the party, recalled at the meeting the dark times of the bourgeois regime in Estonia when hundreds of patriots were languishing in prisons. He said the latest American provocation was clearly dictated by desire to prevent an improvement of Soviet-American relations and torpedo the process of nuclear disarmament. "This is also evidenced by the message sent by George Shultz to the leaders of Estonian emigres", he said.

Tijt Kolk, a student of the politechnical institute, said the recent broadcasts by Western radio stations were an insult to the national feelings of Estonians. "It is humiliating to hear instructions from across the ocean on how we should build our life and assess our history", he stated. "The Estonian people's road to socialism was not an easy one. Today, too, the republic has its problems. But we intend to solve them ourselves without anybody's prompting".

Ludvig Vammus, an honorary citizen of Tallinn and a builder by trade, expressed confidence that "neither the handfull of anti-Soviet extremists nor their stage-managers from across the ocean will succeed in sowing discord between the peoples of the Soviet Union".

Mayor on 'Improvised Meetings'

LD242145 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 2111 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Text] Tallinn, 24 Feb (TASS)—A protest meeting against the interference by Washington official circles in the internal affairs of Soviet Estonia and the instigatory

propaganda by Western "radio voices" took place today in the capital of this Soviet Baltic republic. The West's provocative calls for meetings and demonstrations in Estonia which have been heard in recent days were timed to coincide with a routine anniversary of the declaration of the bourgeois Estonian state.

Despite the refusal by the city authorities to permit the holding of an anti-Soviet meeting, Tallinn Mayor Kharri Lumi told a TASS correspondent, a group of people assembled this evening in the center of Tallinn at the monument to Anton-Khansen Tammsaare, the classical Estonian writer. This attracted the attention of inhabitants and guests of the city.

The Tallinn mayor reported that a discussion arose at the monument about current problems and the historical past of Estonia. As the weather was frosty and windy, the participants in the discussion were invited to hold it in nearby public buildings. Improvised meetings took place there with leading scientists of the republic and deputies of the city soviet. There was a discussion of problems of the economic development of Estonia, relations between the nationalities, ecology, and the democratization of society.

The mayor stressed that the discussions took place in a calm and correct atmosphere. The effort by Western propaganda to provoke anti-Soviet rallies and to cause clashes with representatives of the authorities were in vain, Kharri Lumi stated.

Archbishop on Protest Call

LD251023 Moscow TASS in English 1004 GMT
25 Feb 88

["Estonian Archbishop—Interview"—TASS headline]

[Text] Tallinn February 25 TASS—"The church condemns the interference of any outside forces in the internal affairs of the state", Archbishop Kuna Pajula, head of the Evangelic-Lutheran Church of Estonia, told TASS. According to him, the call by a group of American congressmen to stage anti-Soviet demonstrations in the capital of this Soviet Baltic Republic is an example of such interference.

"Estonia has been living under socialism for nearly 50 years", Archbishop Pajula went on to say. "This system gives our people peace, break, an opportunity of getting an education and cultural development. We can live and work peacefully. The positive processes, currently taking place in our society, are warmly welcomed by parishioners who are wholeheartedly supporting the drive for perestroika (restructuring), democratisation and glasnost (public openness)."

Archbishop Pajula emphasised that the church in Estonia did not stand aloof from pressing contemporary problems, such as the fight for peace, against the threat of a nuclear holocaust.

Pajula said that in 1987 alone the Evangelist-Lutheran Church of Estonia had contributed more than 10,000 roubles (about 15,000 dollars) to the Soviet peace fund. The same year the Estonian church took part in establishing Estonia's cultural foundation which allocates resources for developing national culture, restoring monuments and setting up new museums.

TASS Reports Closure of Industrial Ministry
LD241433 Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 24 TASS—The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet (Parliament) of the Soviet Union has closed the Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food industries and Household Appliances of the USSR as of March 1, 1988, it has been officially announced here.

Biryukova Tour of Chardzhou Oblast Described

Visits Enterprises

PM171335 Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA
in Russian 23 Jan 88 p 1

[Report by TURKMENINFORM special correspondents L. Skachkova, M. Bektasov, A. Orazov: "For a High Standard of Production and Everyday Life; A.P. Biryukova's Visit to Chardzhou Oblast"]

[Text] On 21 January A.P. Biryukova, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, visited the "50-Letiye SSSR" woolen mill. In the weaving shop the CPSU Central Committee secretary inquired of N. Rybkina, former weaving worker and now supervisor of a technological process, how the work is going and what the feeling is among the workers.

"We are coping with the targets and the mood is good," N. Rybkina replied.

"Is the equipment always used in three shifts?" A.P. Biryukova asked.

"Only when we manage to provide the necessary range of fabric, so as not to lose time on reloading," N. Rybkina said.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary visited the drive belt production sector. The factory director Yu.V. Davletyarova explained that woolen belts for the old type of presses are produced here. The question of closing this unprofitable sector has been raised more than once, but as yet its products are still needed. So people here are forced to use equipment manufactured last century....

In the finishing production facility, A.P. Biryukova paused at a machine where a dye fixation process was in progress. A band of fabric with a design was being formed, like the leaves of a book.

"You produce pretty shawls," the CPSU Central Committee secretary said to the worker, admiring the elegant design. "Where do the factory's products go?"

"We send them to the RSFSR, the Ukraine, and the Central Asian republics," enterprise director Yu.V. Davletyarova replied.

In the photographic film printing sector, A.P. Biryukova spoke to team leader V. Suvorov about extending the operating life of imported equipment and stressed the importance of this factor....

"It is in our power to organize proper maintenance of the machines, but there are no spare components for them," team leader V. Suvorov said.

The conversation continued in the selection office.

Factory chief engineer L.S. Saryyeva explained that the collective produces 16 types of shawls. The creation of an artistic selection department had helped improve the quality of the goods.

Last year's plan for the production of index "n" products was considerably overfulfilled.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary inquired about the results of the enterprise's work in 1987 in the new management conditions. E.I. Razumeyev, USSR first deputy minister of light industry, and S. Samadov, Turkmen SSR minister of light industry, took part in the discussion. A.P. Biryukova stressed the need for highly profitable work and noted that the percentage of deductions from profits by the factory collective into the state budget was 10 times less than the average figure for the country's Ministry of Light Industry.

"You must work more persistently to reduce labor expenditure, economize on raw materials, and make fuller use of equipment," the CPSU Central Committee secretary said.

A.P. Biryukova wrote the following entry in the visitors' book: "The mood and elegance not only of Turkmen women but of women of the other fraternal republics depend on you. The implementation of the comprehensive program for radically expanding production and improving the quality of consumer goods depends on you."

Continuing her familiarization with the oblast's life, A.P. Biryukova visited Chardzhouskiy Rayon's Khalturin Kolkhoz. This farm is well known not only for its big harvests. Considerable funds are being spent here on improving the farmers' working and living conditions. Small sports and cultural complexes are being built in the kolkhoz's six sectors, and two of them have already been commissioned. Moreover these facilities are being constructed using the farm's own resources—this is how the complex in the "Komsomol" sector, which the CPSU

Central Committee secretary visited, was built. The small but bright premises contain a club, a medical center, a library, a sewing workshop, and a hairdresser's. Next to it is a sports ground.

At the Khalturin Kolkhoz Culture center A.P. Biryukova was acquainted with the work of the choir and children's choreography schools and visited the kolkhoz museum. Here at the culture center there is a branch of the central library. It contains 6,000 volumes.

However, as A.P. Biryukova noted, the library has little literature—especially sociopolitical literature—in Turkmen. The republic's publishing houses take no account of readers' demands.

A.P. Biryukova attended an amateur artistic concert at the farm's culture center.

After the concert there was a meeting between the CPSU Central Committee secretary and kolkhoz workers.

Addressing the meeting, A.P. Biryukova said: "I greet you, workers of hospitable and sunny Turkmenia, on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee and the Central Committee Secretariat. It is the first time I have visited your republic. This is my 4th day here, and in that short space of time I have managed to visit not only industrial enterprises but also two kolkhozes.

"I consider myself very fortunate to get this familiarization with the life of rural workers. I have visited your families and seen your hospitality and your respectful attitude to representatives of other nationalities. It was pleasing to see for myself that you live and work well. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all the kolkhoz members, who are making a big contribution to the implementation of the Food Program.

"You grow cotton, which is called 'white gold.' And indeed, it is gold. What resources, labor, and experience need to be expended to produce it! It is not easy to grow cotton when there is insufficient water and nearby desert. But people in Turkmenia know how to produce the best cotton in the country. Thank you for your work. I would like to wish you great successes in your difficult work, peace, happiness, and health to all of you and your children."

During a visit to a silk combine, the CPSU Central Committee secretary inquired about questions of work and everyday life and workers' food supplies. In one of the silk-reeling shops A.P. Biryukova paused at the machine tools at which Zh. Rizayeva was working. The conversation turned on the quality of the raw materials.

"We have to use old cocoons too, which do not lend themselves to unwinding very well," Zh. Rizayeva said. "Will we really get good silk from them?"

In the reject stock section, worker Ye. Osadchaya said in reply to the CPSU Central Committee secretary's questions that the combine does not have its own order desk and that choice is limited in the cookshop.

"The city party and soviet organs must pay prime attention to questions of the supply of food products to major labor collectives," A.P. Biryukova stressed. "We must take on board the experience of Belorussia, where there is a wide choice of food products and convenience foods at enterprise cookshops."

The CPSU Central Committee secretary visited various of the combine's production facilities and the workers' canteen, and looked over the consumer service premises.

The discussion on the collective's chronic problem of raw materials quality and above-normative stocks was continued in the selection office.

Combine director E.A. Zinukhina explained that the storehouses contain cocoons valued at R11 million. With time the raw material loses its properties, relative expenditure increases when it is used, the output norm decreases, and the prime cost of production increases. The enterprise leadership believes that it is more expedient to reduce the price of old cocoons and to find a use for them. A.P. Biryukova asked the leaders of the union and republic light industry ministries to resolve this matter.

The combine leadership drew the CPSU Central Committee secretary's attention to the fact that a specially created cocoon-grading inspectorate in Tashkent carries out tests in sterile conditions. As a result cocoon quality is artificially inflated and the combine has to pay extra to the procurement organizations.

"That is improper," A.P. Biryukova noted. "Tests must be conducted on the spot in production conditions, together with representatives of the agroprom, so as to rule out any lack of objectivity in grading and consequently also in fixing prices for the raw material."

The CPSU Central Committee secretary stressed the importance of paying for cocoons by end result, in terms of the output of cotton thread.

"Look what happens," A.P. Biryukova said. "The republic Ministry of Light Industry appropriates a large proportion of the profits from the neighboring silk spinning and waving factory, in order to support the lagging silk combine which is in debt. Ultimately the state suffers. After all, the Turkmen SSR Ministry of Light Industry transfers little money into the state budget compared with the other republic ministries. We must seek to achieve economic viability everywhere."

Then a discussion started on the work of the combine's collective in the new management conditions, is provision with and retention of cadres, the switch to a three-shift system, and the housing problem.

The topic of conversation with workers at a knitwear factory which A.P. Biryukova visited was the increased production of high-quality consumer goods and the expansion of their range.

Special attention was paid to questions of the enterprise's work under conditions of economic accountability [khozraschet]. In conversation with the CPSU Central Committee secretary, factory workers noted that they do not always manage to bring equipment into operation at full capacity. Frequent holdups with raw materials are permitted by the suppliers—the Fergana and Cherkassy combines. This makes it more difficult to switch to multishift working.

Yet the knitwear factory experiences no shortage of cadres.

"We try to create all the conditions for our workers," director A. Kashtanova explained. "They can gain a qualification at the agricultural vocational and technical school, a supply of cooked products and convenience foods is organized, and nearby is the kolkhoz with which we have close commercial links. So cadre turnover is not high."

Familiarized with the state of affairs at the factory, A.P. Biryukova stressed that concern to improve workers' working and living conditions is of great importance. Wherever attention is paid to this, the overall results are higher.

The same day a meeting was held at Chardzhou party obkom between the CPSU Central Committee secretary and the obkom apparatus. A.P. Biryukova stressed the need to reject parasitical sentiments and to bring internal reserves into play more actively.

It is important to focus attention not on achievements but on shortcomings. A party worker's place is not in an office but at the enterprises and in the labor collectives.

Dwelling on the oblast party organization's tasks leading the restructuring of the work of all components of the national economy, A.P. Biryukova noted the need to intensify political leadership methods and show the utmost concern for the working person, and the importance of organizing universal economic education, training leading cadres and specialists, and ensuring their ability to work in conditions of self-management and democracy.

The same day CPSU Central Committee secretary A.P. Biryukova returned to Ashkhabad.

During the tour of Chardzhou Oblast A.P. Biryukova was accompanied by S.A. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee, and A.S. Boyko and Yu.K. Mogilevets, members of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee Bureau.

Attends Turkmen Aktiv Meeting

PM171125 Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA
in Russian 24 Jan 88 p 1

[TURKMENINFORM report: "Meeting of Republic Party-Economic Aktiv"]

[Text] On 23 January a meeting of the party-economic aktiv was held at the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee, with the participation of CPSU Central Committee Secretary A.P. Biryukova. It discussed the work of the republic's party, soviet, and economic organs to increase the production of consumer goods and develop the services sphere in the light of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions.

S.A. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee, opened the meeting with an introductory speech.

The following addressed the meeting: V.S. Chertishchev, first secretary of Ashkhabad party obkom; L.V. Potapov, chairman of Mary Oblispolkom; A.I. Gurin, secretary of the party organization at the Turkmen SSR Ministry of Light Industry Nebit-Dag Hosiery Factory; B. Tagandurdyev, first secretary of Chardzhou party obkom; N.I. Zimenkin, Turkmen SSR minister of local industry; N. Nurklychev, chairman of the Turkmen Potrebsoyuz; and A. Atayev, Turkmen SSR minister of consumer services.

CPSU Central Committee Secretary A.P. Biryukova addressed the meeting (the text of the address will be published in the next issue of the paper).

S.A. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee, gave a concluding address.

Taking part in the work of the meeting were the following members and candidate members of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee Bureau: A.S. Boyko, Kh. Durdyev, V.F. Zhulenev, A. Kurbanova, Yu.K. Mogilevets, S.M. Nesterenko, V.A. Kharkov, A. Khodzhamuradov, Kh. Akhmedov, Ya.P. Gundogdyev, and V.G. Otchertsov.

A.S. Makarov, chief of a CPSU Central Committee sector took part in the meeting's work.

Turkmen Tour Ends

*PM171119 Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA
in Russian 24 Jan 88 p 1*

[TURKMENINFORM report: "A.P. Biryukova's Departure From Turkmenistan"]

[Text] On 23 January CPSU Central Committee Secretary A.P. Biryukova left Ashkhabad for Moscow.

She was seen off at the airport by S.A. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee; A. Khodzhamuradov, chairman of the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers; S.M. Nesterenko, second secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee; and other republic party and government leaders.

Kapitonov Central Auditing Commission Speech

*PM191321 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Feb 88
Second Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "Session of CPSU Central Auditing Commission"]

[Text] A session of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission was held on 18 February. It discussed the results of the commission's work in 1987 and the tasks for 1988 in the light of the decisions of the 27th party congress and at the new stage of restructuring.

I.V. Kapitonov, chairman of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission, delivered the report. The CPSU Central Committee February (1988) Plenum, he said, which has examined the course of the restructuring of secondary and higher education and the tasks involved in implementing it, was an important political event in the life of the party and the country.

The vivid and substantial speech at the plenum by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, raised topical tasks of the party's ideological work at the present stage. Its main attention focused on such fundamental problems as the ideological backup for restructuring, the further improvement of our society's political system, and the enhancement of the party's role as its nucleus.

The detailed report delivered by Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, analyzed in depth the progress in the fulfillment of the reform of public education, presented its first results, and outlined ways of deepening the reform in conditions of restructuring, the acceleration of socio-economic development, the democratization of society, and the expansion of glasnost.

Reporting on the Central Auditing Commission's work in the last year, I.V. Kapitonov noted that it was aimed at stepping up auditing work in the party, deepening the

methodological assistance given to local auditing commissions, and broadening glasnost. The Central Auditing Commission held regular commission and bureau sessions.

For the purposes of providing methodological assistance to local party organizations' auditing commissions, the Central Auditing Commission analyzed and generalized the materials on their work. The documents of All-Union Republic Communist Party Auditing Commissions were studied, as were those of kray and oblast party organizations in the RSFSR. Central Auditing Commission members familiarized themselves with the activity of a number of auditing commissions at local level.

An analysis of these materials showed that on the whole auditing work within the party has revived somewhat. Many auditing commissions have begun to exercise their functions more fully, to evaluate the situation more critically, and to expose shortcomings more determinedly. Attention to auditing work by party committees has also increased.

At the same time, quite a few auditing commissions lost time in the initial stage of restructuring and did not begin real work. The force of inertia, passivity, and the desire to work in the old way have still not been eliminated everywhere. As a result the restructuring of the work of these commissions is proceeding slowly.

During examination of the fulfillment of the party's 1986 budget it was noted that incomes had exceeded expenditure. At the same time, attention was drawn to omissions in the financial and economic activity of certain party committees and in their spending of budget resources, and to shortcomings in the payment of members' party subscriptions. In a number of party organizations, the amount of the underpayment increased and subscription arrears increased.

In view of the situation which has come about, the Central Auditing Commission together with the Party Organizational Work Department and the Administration of Affairs of the CPSU Central Committee have carried out a comprehensive check into the payment of membership subscriptions in the Chechen-Ingush Oblast party organization. It was established that the payment of members' subscriptions was neglected there and that the party statutes were often broken. In some party organizations, the number of people in arrears amounted to half of all Communists, but even that fact was not reflected in the accounts. Such shortcomings are also in evidence in a number of other party organizations.

The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat adopted a resolution on the basis of the results of the check in the Chechen-Ingush oblast party organization.

The speaker dwelt in detail on the comprehensive check of the financial-economic and production activity of the CPSU Central Committee's Political Literature Publishing House conducted by the Central Auditing Commission in conjunction with departments of the CPSU Central Committee. It was noted that on the whole the Political Literature Publishing House is doing its job. The materials of party congresses and CPSU Central Committee plenums and the speeches of party and government leaders are being published promptly. The publishing house constantly fulfills its financial plans, and contributions to the party budget are increasing.

At the same time, the check exposed quite a few shortcomings, primarily in the publication of literature on topical questions and problems of restructuring. Serious omissions were revealed in the activity of the main editorial board and in the selection and placement of cadres, work with the authors' aktiv, and other matters.

The results of the check were sent to the CPSU Central Committee and examined by the party Central Committee Secretariat, which adopted a detailed resolution. It is aimed at the fundamental improvement of the publishing house's work and the resolute elimination of the shortcomings revealed. The discussion of the work of the Political Literature Publishing House's work and the measures taken have had a positive effect on its work.

Last year the Central Auditing Commission checked the observance of the procedure for dealing with cases and work with letters, statements, and complaints by working people at the CPSU Central Committee Culture Department. The results of the check have been passed on to the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat.

The speaker also reported on work with letters and statements sent directly to the Central Auditing Commission. In 1987 3,500 were received. On the instructions of the bureau some letters were examined by Central Auditing Commission members at local level.

Central Auditing Commission bureau sessions examined various questions, in particular, the effectiveness of the use of the resources provided by the budget for medical measures, reports on the work of the auditing commissions of the Tatar ASSR and Tula Oblast party organizations, and other matters.

Speaking about the tasks facing the Central Auditing Commission in the new stage of restructuring, I.V. Kapitonov stressed that it is necessary to deepen the positive changes occurring in auditing work, give it new content, and expand glasnost. Central Auditing Commission members must take part actively in checks and audits, strengthen ties with local party organizations' auditing commissions, and give them the necessary methodological assistance.

A.P. Kharlamov, chief editor of SELSKAYA ZHIZN; P.P. Laptev, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee General Department; T.I. Snetkova, a microcircuit assembler at the "Pozitron" science and production association in Leningrad; and A. Dzhumagulov, chairman of the Kirghiz SSR Council of Ministers, who addressed the session, described their work experience and expressed a number of criticisms and suggestions to improve auditing work.

The session approved the CPSU Central Auditing Commission's plan of work for 1988.

Monument To Be Erected to Chernobyl Heroes
LD241034 Moscow TASS in English 1016 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 24 TASS—A monument to the Soviet citizens who died when coping with the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station will be installed at the Mitinskoye Cemetery near Moscow, the newspaper MOSCOW NEWS writes today.

Twenty-six graves stretched along the cemetery's central lane. Firemen who gave their lives in the name of saving thousands of people are buried here. Those who blocked pipes, switched off equipment, prevented the possibility of further explosions, took away people who suffered injuries and burns were together with them on that tragic night. The monument is the tribute of respect to all of Chernobyl's heroes.

The newspaper reports that the terms of the contest for the best blueprint of the monument is under discussion at the USSR Culture Ministry now. The terms of the contest, which will last till May 20, will be printed in the press in several days. Mikhail Umanets, director of the Chernobyl nuclear power station, is among the members of the jury.

Kiev Plants Hiring Out-of-Towners Face Tax
PM230937 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Feb 88
Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent S. Tsikora report "Every Kiev Enterprise Has To Contribute R12,400 to the Local Budget for Every Worker It Recruits From Outside the City"]

[Text] Kiev—A new rule has been introduced in Kiev: For every worker recruited from outside the city enterprises will have to pay R12,400 into the local budget.

The money has to be paid by enterprises which recruit workers, vocational-technical school graduates, or young specialists who have no housing in Kiev. All money for the registration of citizens from other cities is to be paid into the city's coffers and will be used exclusively for the expansion and development of social, consumer, and municipal amenities. Why has the city resorted to such an unusual "tax?"

There is virtually no rayon center where economic managers are not trying to persuade local authorities that without recruiting new workers they will not be able to cope with the augmented production plans. Soviets capable of summoning up enough strength to induce enterprises to introduce high-performance equipment and improved technology instead of increasing the number of workers are few and far between.

This is a situation, I repeat, with which all local soviet officials are familiar. People in the Kiev gorispolkom too have grown tired of unending pleas and constant pressure from economic managers. Just as in many other places, a strict ban on the registration of citizens from elsewhere in the city was often on the point of adoption but was not in fact adopted. As a result the waiting list for housing grew from year to year. Last year more than 200,000 people were on the list in Kiev. Two new housing districts were built in the city, but this had virtually no impact on the waiting list or the number of so-called quota workers.

It was then that the Kiev Gorispolkom decided to apply economic measures instead of administrative methods. Instead of listening to the eloquent pleas of economic managers, they decided to rely entirely on material factors. They took the view that if production really cannot manage without new workers, then the enterprise or department will find the money to pay for their registration.

The question was submitted for discussion by the city soviet and received full support from the deputies. It must be emphasized that the adopted decision changes nothing in the case of the rules governing the exchange of housing between people living in different parts of the city or in different cities. They remain the same as before: No money is due from people involved in an exchange between cities. The decision of the Kiev Soviet is not based on a desire to make the city inaccessible to people from other parts. The main consideration here is a fair division of concern for citizens between departments and soviets, between the production and the service sphere. How are their relations developing today? When an enterprise has obtained a quota for employing people from outside the city, and when it has recruited the number of specialists it needs, all its problems are solved, and that is all it cares for. But the city has to take care of the new inhabitants day after day, year after year. At first it has to provide temporary accommodation, then the new inhabitants have to be registered on the housing list and provided with regular apartments. Provision has to be made for places in kindergartens, schools, polyclinics. It is necessary to take into account that all new inhabitants will use local transport, stores, laundries, cinemas, and so forth. All this is costing soviets "a fair bit of money."

When Kiev economists added up what all this comes to, they whistled with surprise: The upkeep of one new citizen costs the city R12,400! There is no denying that

this is an impressive figure. But for a city whose population long ago topped the 2.5 million mark, a real opportunity to control labor resources is even more valuable.

The resolution on the contribution of R12,400 for every new citizen recruited from outside the city came into force on 1 January 1988. A month has passed. How have enterprise managers and department leaders reacted to this resolution? Have their mutual relations with the ispolkom on the subject of quota workers changed?

Rayon commissions for the rational utilization of labor resources have received several dozen applications from plants and institutions giving the reasons for the recruitment in Kiev of people from outside the city. Each such application was accompanied by a warrant for the payment of the required sum. Yet under the new conditions of management, enterprises have to pay out of their own, earned profit. They will think twice before dipping into their pockets. This means that applicants really need the extra labor. The ispolkom commissions have complied with the requests of 20 enterprises and institutions. The permission to register in Kiev has been granted to 1,314 people. The city budget will gain an additional R16,300,000 in 1988.

I asked who the new citizens are? Almost half of them are vocational-technical school and medical college graduates. The rest are construction workers and machine operators. There is another characteristic point—enterprises are providing hostel accommodation for the new workers. The enterprise directors where the new people will work and the city leaders have a clear idea how the new Kiev inhabitants will be fixed up.

How effective this economic method of management of labor resources is, whether it will have a real impact on the migration of the population and help to resolve the city's social problems more effectively is another question. So far not enough time has elapsed to make a serious analysis and generalize the results. There is one noticeable result: There are fewer sharp economic managers in the corridors of the Kiev Gorispolkom ready to promise anything, just to obtain a permission to register new citizens.

Philosopher Calls for Unfettered Public Debate
PM181800 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian 16 Feb 88 p 3

[Article by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Prof L. Goldin under the rubric "More Democracy, More Socialism": "A Voice for Everyone, Glasnost for All"—first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA KULTURA introduction]

[Text] What are the dialectics of our rights and duties in the ongoing process of democratization? What is the role of public dialogue and of public opinion in the system for the management of society? How do we see standards of

debate? These complex questions were touched upon in the articles "Individual Rights and a Few Words About the Ability To Use Them" by Nikolay Popov (28 January 1988) and "Dialogue About Dialogue" by Valentin Tolstykh (30 January 1988). The discussion is continued today by an expert in the sphere of management theory.

Calls for dialogue and debate can be heard everywhere. However, the voices of those who believe that we are talking too much are also becoming louder. Such people perceive the ideas of discipline and order as alternatives to the polyphony of opinions and positions (even though it is a matter of interconnected terms). You cannot embarrass them with the question of socialist pluralism. All this, they say, is for newspapers, heavyweight journals, and television linkups; when it comes to their own departments, if there is any debate at all, it is only about how best to execute the leadership's instructions.

Narrow minds cling tightly to images gleaned from their schooldays of Sparta and similar situations from the not so distant past: There you had real order! It is naive to hope to shake these views by means of lessons from history, even though they eloquently testify that Sparta's regimented state with its iron discipline brought no prosperity to its citizens and left nothing worthy for future generations. The greatest material and spiritual values bequeathed to mankind by ancient Hellas were created in Athens, with its arguments in the agora questioning even recognized authorities.

But even those who believe that broad public dialogue is a mandatory condition of democratization and progress have today come up against a most serious problem which substantially weakens their position: We yearn for swift and unambiguous truths and solutions suitable for all occasions. There obviously is something nostalgically attractive in the banalities of "short courses" [reference to Stalin's "Short Course in the History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)"] or in the resolutely uncompromising nature of ideas and actions according to Lysenko's prescription. How can you fail to recall Hegel: "A servile mind stubbornly insists on its own uniqueness." Having discovered that the world is not monochrome, that it is multifaceted, that different positions and different assessments exist, we—or in any case many of us—are not all that pleased with this multiplicity of hues and the huge range of problems that come into view. As the poet wrote, "I somehow dislike the fragmentary nature of the universe...."

It was, of course, simpler to live in conditions when some people laid down the law and others obeyed it, when it was clearly known who enjoyed the monopoly of truth. The idea that someone holds the key to the solution of all complexities in the world, that someone knows how to make everybody happy without asking what people want, is convenient; it creates an impression of social stability. It is a different matter when, having said "I

approve of this," one is forced—like Diogenes Laertius—to inevitably add: "But I disagree with that." "Labels" that crush opponents outright still remain in the arsenals but are no longer used in decent society.

This also applies to practical matters: Should the courses of rivers be reversed? Where are AES's to be built? Should a movie be released or shelved? It is obvious that, even if you have the wisdom of Solomon, you cannot make a one-man decision that is valid and not fraught with social damage without engaging in polemics, without allowing your opponents the right to hold their own views, no matter how great your personal powers are.

As a matter of fact, we were invited to engage in dialogue before. But although everyone was given a rostrum and a glass of water, we somehow ceased questioning ourselves and others. This may have been a case not so much of fear of the consequences of expressing a critical opinion as of subconscious self-defense against impoverished thinking and unintelligible arguments.... It was perfectly possible to save your soul at such spectacular events, which oppressed both spirit and dignity, by not listening, by feigning enthusiasm, by going on record with banalities and "specific" proposals that circumvented the essence of problems. This is another method of self-defense.

Such methods no longer work today.

Passions are running high, the tone is harsh, and the clashes are fierce.... On the one hand, it is gratifying that different viewpoints—even very controversial at times—are being expressed, gratifying for the novelty of the situation if for no other reason. But what are we to do when one writer sees rock music as the embodiment of progress, while another sees it as a moral AIDS. All this is aired in the press, in central newspapers. How are we to determine who is to be admired, who is to be applauded, and who is to be reproached. Then voices are heard saying: Is it not time for these polemics to be "kept within bounds"? But surely the entire difficulty consists in determining where the limits of bounds commensurate with the time and with the public interest lie. Though many are prepared to take on the job of clearly indicating who is "one of us," who is a sociopath, and who is a malicious slanderer loosening the bolts on the tracks of socialism, the question of what is permissible and what goes too far is the most complex question in social psychology.

When it comes to the style of debate, we are historically untutored in courteous conversation. Yuriy Nagibin wrote: "It is as if no one on the Russian Parnassus has heard of propriety or the style of quiet, intelligible discussion. People immediately start foaming bloodily at the mouth, and swinging blows are struck, all of them below the belt." This causes considerable difficulties, and not only ethical ones, either. For example, "Dictatorship of Conscience" was conceived as a political, intellectual discussion between stage and audience, and

the author wanted to invite virtually the entire country to take part in the dispute. But no, we are not ready for such a considered and responsible discussion. It is stifled by both stagnant thinking and hysterical impatience.

It is necessary to perceive all aspects of the problem of extreme assessments. People should not be classed as retrograde simply because they do not like "Repentance" or "The Executioner's Block." Not even "Children of the Arbat" should put us on different sides of the barricades. It must be recognized as natural that the greater the importance of a phenomenon in spiritual life is, the more acute the arguments are. It can't be helped—I can see many weak pages in "The Executioner's Block." I admire Yu. Bondarev's brilliant speeches and journalism (what about his description of a colleague of mine as "prankster and philosopher"). But his "Moments" is, in my view, a very modest work. Let a dissonant note sound among the chorus of enthusiasm for "Heart of a Dog" at Moscow's Children's Theater: I would like to suggest that Genriyetta Yanovskaya stage "Lolita." It would fit in with the theater's speciality, and there'd be quite a fuss and outcry....

There is neither proper glasnost nor comprehensiveness in evaluating the works of even a master like Astafyev. I recall that, having read "On a Clear Day," I went on to read "The Sun Also Rises"—their heroes suffer similar personal tragedies. It was difficult to avoid comparisons, with Astafyev winning as far as I was concerned even though, according to critical canons, "The Sun Also Rises" is the American author's best novel. Not only is Astafyev closer to the hearts of many people, but many also hold him in greater artistic esteem than the most famous writers of the century. But why, though this opinion is quite widely held, is it never seen bluntly expressed in the press? I am speaking about Astafyev also because recently he has been the victim of quite a few undeserved reproaches and false rumors. Had they been voiced in print, they would have been refuted by Astafyev's works themselves. But anonymous letters are circulating, and idle talk is filling the "information gap."

Why are we so afraid of expanding the range of assessments and judgments? Why are we so resolute in our desire to make other people's choices for them and shoulder what ought to be their responsibility?

The movie "Dirty Joke," which spent 22 years gathering dust on the shelf... How I would like to hear frank arguments put forward both by those who are convinced of its harmfulness and by those who believe it to be of the utmost topicality.

Here is an example from a different sphere. For a long time, Academician T.I. Zaslavskaya had to set out her principled ideas mainly in notes for a narrow readership rather than having them published as monographs. But why is it that her most resolute opponents today speak out chiefly while standing in lines in stores?

I think that the situation is worst of all in management dialogue, where the image of businesslike efficiency is so firmly linked with tough talking and total license in assessments, that Dal and Baudouin de Courtenay, with their professional interest in swearwords, would certainly find much that is new to learn.

The "apparatus" in both the leadership of the economy and science has never allowed room for debate on fundamental questions of economic management. This is not just a matter of the personal qualities of its staffers. The officials' tendency to think only in terms of monologue has deep economic roots. The reorganization and apparatus cutbacks often hit the "dissenters" first and reinforce corporative trends. Who will dare argue with the boss, who will dare put forward a crazy idea when so many managers and scientific personnel have suddenly found themselves surplus to requirements?

Back before the time of glasnost, Yuriy Chernichenko did the work of an entire agricultural institute. Nikolay Shmelev's article—no matter what you think of it—rocked economic thinking more than dozens of approved monographs and conferences with prestigious speakers could have done. Zalygin's "Turning Point" counted for more than a whole volume of feasibility studies signed by established specialists. What about "Misleading Figures," an article which overturned the postulates of the pillars of state statistics? And Rubin's duels with departmentalism?

You cannot avoid the question: What would have happened if these authors had been officials of the departments concerned and had disputed views held by the leaders of those departments?

I recall one occasion after a concert by Irina Berkovich at one of Moscow's research institutes when members of the audience—specialists no longer in their first youth—gathered backstage. Apparently they were genuine music lovers, because they were not discussing music at all.... As is customary in our country, they were talking shop after shop hours. It was said, as though it were common knowledge, that the ecological consequences of the operation of extremely large heat supply stations could produce a global catastrophe. We laymen were dumbfounded: Had Bach's preludes generated these apocalyptic images? It transpired not, this was not news to power industry specialists, but who among "their own people" could say this aloud? True, it is said that writers already have their eyes on this issue.... But how can you admire writers for their civic courage, which thrives in conditions of silence on the part of those who ought logically to speak up, contend, argue, and make decisions?

Departments employ thousands of economists, sociologists, and psychologists. Even those who "call the tune" find it boring to read them or listen to them. I am convinced that both the authorities and the people could find social scientists as interesting as Vysotskiy and Zhvanetskiy. But can anyone seriously believe that this

can be achieved by certification and a review of the incentives system? Freedom of thought and open dialogue—this is all that is needed.

A scientist today can, without the slightest apprehension, debate propositions contained in a party document or speeches by state leaders. For example, is there opposition to restructuring? Or the usurpation of means of production by the bureaucracy and all the ensuing consequences. Editors do not edit out of articles paragraphs and reminders that never in history has any privileged social group committed voluntary mass economic and political harakiri, nor do they cross out reflections on the experience of Lev Tolstoy and his disciples in the sphere of self-improvement beginning with oneself.

But when it comes to your own department, your own director or minister...

Why does this happen? Is it because prophets are without honor in their own country? This is more than just a matter of traditionally skeptical attitudes toward subordinates' views. The departmental system makes each official so vulnerable that a cause for complaint can be found at any time. I am not talking about heroes who are prepared to throw themselves bodily in the line of fire.

At any rate, even to this day a major economic manager or a famous scientist will find little joy in complete frankness and an independent stance unless they happen to be masochists. The departmental atmosphere is particularly pernicious for creative people. Thousands of both formal and informal criteria, thousands of frequently contradictory instructions and directives... A situation whereby people cannot take even a single independent step for fear of breaching some instruction or other still largely prevails today....

People keep silent in such an atmosphere. They obey orders, swallowing any inward protest. However, this cannot continue for long; the human personality cannot endure such a split. Workers leave (if there is somewhere for them to go without suffering undue losses). Or they turn into unthinking toadying functionaries. Now they can be boldly summoned to be innovative and daring.

This is why to reason that "We've talked enough, now let's get down to work, comrades," is simply dangerous. Uninhibited speech is an essential condition for creative work.

Of course there is a lot of scum on the wave of glasnost. You can only marvel at the savage intolerance, demagoguery, and conceit you hear in the voices of perfectly educated people. But have these people landed among us from another planet? To keep silent about their existence is the same as concealing the true picture of alcoholism, drug addiction, and prostitution. Society must be aware of its problems. This will help in perceiving their scale and ensure the consolidation of healthy forces. At times even a pointed critical article will not be as effective as

an obscurantist's or a demagogue's self-exposure. When you hear the paranoid arguments used by our home-grown witch-hunters, when you see demonstrators at Ostankino eager for a change of scene, you get the feeling which is so well expressed by the Queen in Heine's "The Dispute": "...But the rabbi and the capuchin stink alike."

Nobody should be silenced in a society with firm legal foundations. If you have exposed a scoundrel, you will be rewarded. If you have slandered an innocent, you will answer under the law. Therefore, neither extremism nor demagoguery are grounds for curbing public dialogue.

It must be borne in mind that, if someone cannot find positive solutions, the need for self-expression and self-assertion may take the most paradoxical of forms. You may be puny, insignificant, and unproductive, but once you have exposed Sergey Solovyev as a secret freemason, demanded that Alla Pugacheva be banned, and dismissed Averintsev or Lotman as being out of touch with life, you feel like a real man. We have to put up with opponents like these, and restructuring does not abolish all stupidity, jealousy, and malice, nor does it preclude "...an alliance linking Mozart and Salieri, two sons of harmony."

The dialectics of restructuring are such that those who believe that we owe the victory of socialism and the rout of fascism to Stalin, and those who are convinced that nobody else inflicted as much harm on socialism and its defense capability as Stalin, belong to the same party and live in and love the same country. We must live and work together....

M.S. Gorbachev said that "everyone has his own social experience, his own level of knowledge and education, his own specific way of perceiving events. Hence the huge range of opinions, convictions, and assessments, which naturally demand careful consideration and comparison." This multiplicity of ideas and positions is our strength rather than our weakness, and we must learn to utilize it sensibly.

After all, the history of ideas and creativity is the history of the struggle of ideas and viewpoints. In order to be able to uphold your positions and beliefs, you need strong reasoning and developed intellectual muscles, which wither away without real competitive exercise. So then you are feeble and cry: "What are the competent organs doing?" But why not show concern for your own competence? Or entrust matters to those who are capable of holding their own in the face of a sophisticated adversary who is not bound hand and foot. Then the competent organs will have a bit less to worry about.

But dialogue by no means always means confrontation. It is also a method for seeking reliable allies, disciples, and followers. Socrates was the first to really perceive the importance of dialogue as an essential condition for arriving at the truth and consolidating ideas and people.

He saw that the path to truth lies through dispute, through the revelation of all viewpoints without any taboo topics. The essence of Socratic discussion and thinking based on dialogue is that truth does not spring up in a single person's head but is born in the process of free debate. Socrates argued, at times with real opponents, at other times with imaginary ones. But he never tried to misrepresent or distort his opponent's arguments because this would inevitably tend to profane his own idea and weaken his own position. This was fully understood by Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and they reflected it in their creativity and their ability to make common cause with "dissenters." This approach was totally rejected by Stalin.

An active public dialogue occurs only at stages of upsurge, renewal, and expanding scales of spiritual freedom. In contrast, monologue-based thinking and leaders [vozhd] as the ultimate arbiters of truth are always indicators of intensifying totalitarianism and a feudal atmosphere in society. Social conditions certainly determine the possibility of genuine dialogue.... But dialogue, in turn, stimulates civic awareness and social activeness and is a necessary condition for struggle against apathy and stagnation.

The roots of monologue-based thinking should be sought in history. The feudal lord's total license in behavior and assessments, the fear of superiors, and sycophancy are all symptoms of a vulgar illness contracted in conditions in which the principle of hierarchical dependence on someone above you deciding your fate was the foundation of social psychology. Bureaucratic hierarchy and the bureaucratic style of relationships inherit this principle. Here you have a leader who issues calls, who lectures and reprimands, and who holds forth with equal mettle on economic accountability, social justice (he is, of course, its bearer), and high ideology.... There are no problems on which he is not competent to speak. As with the pope, he is in a state of grace immediately he is appointed to office, and everyone else can only be thankful that their eyes have now been opened and they have realized how they must now live and work. We encourage him with applause and enthusiastic smiles and consolidate the familiar stereotype.

History has shown that the monopoly of truth inherent in monologue-based thinking leads to a dead end both in social life and in the economy because the influx of fresh ideas dries up at once, and social apathy is established. But I agree that people must learn to conduct dialogue. Education efforts alone in the work to nurture democratic habits of thinking and behavior are, of course, not enough, but they ought not to be overlooked.

Carnegie's little book "How to Win Friends..." was quite popular among managers in the past. Written for traveling salesmen, it teaches manipulation by behavior and words. An approach of dubious moral value...

At this point, by the way, I would like to recall Lenin's idea that if someone treats his comrades in the common cause like "pawns," no theoretical correctness can cover up his repulsive personal qualities. Verbal manipulation is hardly any better than the sharp and direct approach to which we are accustomed.

But if we are to learn the art of dialogue, today we have a quite a good source of help in the form of video training, which is actively used to improve leaders' skills. To see yourself in conversation as others see you at times produces acute psychological stress, even in hardened leaders who are not inclined toward introspection. It provides a highly effective cure for arrogance, self-confidence, and narrow-minded views of the world and of people.

Look how our participants in television linkups and in duels of ideas and world outlooks have developed! What an enormous role is played by television in shaping the new dialogue-based thinking and direct and unfettered judgments....

As many people as possible must be given an opportunity to speak out in a principled way and take a clear social stance. If for no other reason, then at least in order to prevent them from sitting back, remaining uninvolved, and covering themselves against any eventuality. The fate of restructuring must determine the personal fate of not only political leaders.

In conclusion, without mincing words, I would like to ask: How would we assess restructuring if it produced nothing more than glasnost and unprecedented expansion of the bounds of individual freedom and dignity? What would be its place in history? I think that the answer would be unambiguous. Everyone has been given an opportunity to choose whether to be a zombie or a free, thinking man. Whether to live in a society reminiscent of a fossilized block (even if you describe it as a monolith), or to shape social relations worthy of the humanist ideals of Marxism. Whether to wait until you are swallowed up by a "black hole" where even atoms cease to move, or to go through the difficulties of restructuring and reach for the stars.

...Professor L.P. Buyeva, my first philosophy teacher at university, once said: The intelligentsia is praying for restructuring. Our prayer still sounds somewhat discordant, some voices are at times out of harmony. But we are no longer deluded by the deceptively dulcet tones of a chorus performing in unison. We know the cost of a single beat set by the drum major's imperious hand.

Reader Claims Legal Rights Exist Only in Press
PM191740 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian
18 Feb 88 p 3

[Letter from tour leader A. Malakov in Pavlograd, Dnepropetrovsk Oblast, forming part of roundup of letters responding to N. Popov's article "Individual Rights and How To Exercise Them" in 28 January issue: "How Can You Escape an Administrator?"—boldface as published]

[Text] Of the recent publications, the strongest impression was made by the article by Doctor of Historical Sciences N. Popov. An intelligent and much needed article. Please write on these subjects more often!

I am worried about the problem of the antidemocratic traditions which have taken root in our country. We seem to have plenty of rights. You need only look at the Constitution. But in practice it turns out differently.

I work in the sphere of tourism. I have twice attended courses to improve my qualifications. After the courses I wanted to organize something in our travel and excursion bureau to get rid of routine and mediocrity, to ensure that the work was discussed by the collective, and not only in the narrow circle of the administration. And what did I achieve? Precisely nothing! Even worse: I damaged my relationship with the leadership and they cut my wages. And don't take a wrong step, or they'll eat you. I understand all that. But what I cannot understand is why justice cannot be achieved, when, judging from the newspapers, democracy has spread far and wide through our country?

Or perhaps in all such cases the problem is that the labor collective itself is passive and inert, indifferent to what is happening?

The author of the article is right. It is all the result of the "slave mentality," the fear of making a noise. For decades people were intimidated and oppressed for their opinions, for taking a critical view of what was happening. How can people get over that overnight? The leaders still have more power than the working people themselves. And the methods of "working" with those who do not agree with you are still the same—collect compromising material, settle scores through a public organization or on an administrative basis. And those who support the one who "spoke out" are treated in the same way.

Yet there is the prosecutor's office, the higher bodies, the party committees, after all! Yes, officially the Constitution guarantees us rights and protection from persecution, and state and public organizations are called upon to implement our Fundamental Law in their actions. But give me just one example where someone who was unjustly injured or oppressed has obtained justice immediately or at least relatively quickly. I have not met anyone like that. Yet I often meet people who have been struggling for years, who become embittered and lose their human feelings. The impression is that we have two laws—one open [glasnyy] law, for everyone, and another unwritten law, under which the rights of those in power are usually protected.

In my view, at present the only place where a person can really exercise his constitutional rights is in our press. But alas, nothing can save the daredevil from the vengeance of the zealous administrator when he reads the letter in the newspaper.

Can this be what V.I. Lenin and his comrades meant by "democracy"?

TV Foreign Affairs Reporting Challenged

PM211531 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian
16 Feb 88 p 5

[Article by Vladimir Tsvetov under the rubric "Deliberations in Front of the Television Screen": "By an Open Fire"]

[Text] "I very much like your reports in 'The World Today' program. Could you please send me some Japanese fishing line, 0.15 and 0.25 mm in diameter?" (V. Yermeyev, Kustanay).

"I am a regular viewer of the program on Japan which you present. Could you please tell me where I can buy a Japanese tape recorder?" (G. Batayev, Alma-Ata).

You must agree that letters like these (I used to receive them when I was doing television work), though not numerous, are, to put it mildly, discouraging. Surely a television program on international affairs should generate ideas other than about ways to acquire goods that are in short supply? It would be so easy to accuse the writers of those letters of having limited interests. But could it be that the letters about fishing lines and tape recorders were prompted by the limited framework within which television programs report international events and present international problems?

Wishing to explain relativity to one of his students in the simplest possible terms, Einstein said: "A whole hour in your boyfriend's arms seems to you like a minute, but one minute inside a hot oven seems like a whole hour. That's relativity." I recall the great physicist's metaphor in response to anyone who might object to the term "limited" as applied to television programs on international affairs.

We have always explained the USSR's foreign policy, reported and commented on events abroad, exposed imperialism's actions in the international arena, analyzed interimperialist contradictions, and described other peoples' lives and customs. But priority was given to the coverage of strike struggles, racial discrimination, unemployment. Those who disagreed with our foreign policy views were more often than not depicted in black hues and, if it came to successes scored outside our own country, they were invariably described as "so-called."

The outcome of the struggle between journalists and bureaucrats always depended—here I repeat an idea which I expressed some time ago—upon which of them was more insistent. And since nowadays bureaucrats are afraid to openly demonstrate that they are bureaucrats, journalists find it easier to gain victory. And this is why journalists are more frequently driven not by fear of bureaucrats but by concern for the final result of their work. The result is there to be seen, without going any

further than television. International programs have become bolder and more honest when it comes to the subject matter they cover. But this is no longer enough for viewers. And they are again accusing television of limited scope in its coverage of world events.

"Previous reports from capitalist countries showed only the unemployed and homeless. Now there are fewer such reports. It is still unclear, however, how farmers, workers, and employees actually live." (A. Myslivets, Vitebsk Oblast)

"Extracts from Western newspapers are often quoted in 'The World Today' program. At times it is even emphasized that some newspaper or other, which can hardly be accused of being sympathetic toward our country, makes a positive assessment of Soviet policy and is sharply critical of its own government's stance. If this is the case, what has happened to the trampled freedom of speech in bourgeois society?" (I. Shapovalova, Talmakh)

"Television has recently made known the views of our ideological adversaries on international questions. But these are major politicians or famous Western journalists. What arguments are used by ordinary workers and ordinary employees who disagree with us?" (G. Bratsev, Moscow)

Even so, it seems to me that these shortcomings of television programs on international topics are not the main reason that some television viewers write letters to journalists which would be much more appropriately addressed to the Ministry of Trade. The aforementioned shortcomings are a sign of the growing pains of international television journalism, and now they are fairly easy to overcome. In my view, the problem lies elsewhere.

There were times when television programs on international topics were far more popular than programs on domestic issues. This was primarily due to the unusual and at times exotic viewing they offered. I can assume that "Spotlight on Restructuring" is now viewed by more people than, say, "International Panorama." And this is only to be expected. It can be asserted with a large measure of confidence: Following broad discussion and thorough study, our society's topical problems which are raised in, for example, "Spotlight on Restructuring," will probably result in decisions by party and state organs, as has happened with a whole series of initiatives in the economy, the social sphere, and culture which were put forward by the press after the 27th CPSU Congress. But I cannot recall a single question raised in a television program on international topics or in a newspaper's pages devoted to international life which was ultimately reflected in party or government decisions on foreign policy.

International journalists simply did not deal with such matters. They are still not dealing with them. And this is not because they are incapable of doing so. Both newspapers and television have enough journalists who think

in an original and fresh fashion. The cause of this phenomenon was identified—and correctly so, in my opinion—by television viewer V. Matveyev from Leningrad. "How is it," he wrote, "that we committed mistakes in domestic policy, admitted them, and are now striving to correct them. We are correcting mistakes in the sphere of national relations and culture. But surely we must have committed mistakes on many occasions in international affairs? It is simply illogical to think that no mistakes were made!..."

In contrast to economic, social, and cultural policy, we have not "taken stock" of our past foreign policy, and this prevents international journalists from anticipating rather than reporting events.

It cannot be said that attempts are not being made to involve the broad public in the discussion and interpretation of possible alternative options or new paths for Soviet foreign policy. Let me refer to a discussion in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI between Academician Ye. Primakov and IZVESTIYA political observer A. Bovin. They discussed whether it is worth conducting talks with the Reagan administration. A. Bovin held that it is not worth getting into a discussion on any matter with this administration. Ye. Primakov held an opposite view. Life has proved the incorrectness of the first view and the fruitfulness of the second. Nonetheless, I think that the ideas expressed by A. Bovin were useful. People who were at that time working on the U.S. proposals for the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles probably did not overlook either A. Bovin's arguments or the counterarguments used by those who held them to be justified.

When Antisthenes, a philosopher in ancient Greece, was asked how politics ought to be approached, he replied: "Like a fire: Don't get too near so as not to get burned, but don't stand too far away so as not to freeze." The room temperature in which international journalists exist does not suit television viewers, radio listeners, or readers. It nauseates even the journalists themselves. Like their colleagues who cover domestic economic, social, and cultural topics, they would readily enter the heat, provided, like their colleagues, they had reliable protective clothing: a complete and objective analysis of our past foreign policy.

The contribution made by the most diverse strata of our society, even children, to the easing of confrontation between the two world powers was correctly and highly assessed during the Soviet-U.S. summit talks. Indeed, children's dreams do become adults' grand designs. I would dare to assume that journalists' dreams could be equally grand and topical as well, and this is very valuable since it is exceptionally important for politicians to have a grasp of the times. But for the time being, television will probably continue to receive now and again letters like this:

"We never miss 'The World Today' program. We have a question: How long should you boil Japanese noodles? We can get them now." (the Proskuryakov family, Kuybyshev)

Director Discusses Theme of 'Repentance'
PM191349 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Feb 88
Second Edition p 3

[Article by movie director and USSR People's Artist Tengiz Abuladze under the rubric "From Recent Mail": "'Repentance' and Evil"]

[Text] More than a year has passed since what was for me the long-awaited day when the feature movie "Repentance" began to be widely shown nationwide. Reaction to it both at home and abroad surpassed the authors' most "ambitious" forecasts.

We were not so naive as to hope for unequivocal recognition of the idea and its embodiment. Nonetheless, we feel only a sense of gratitude to all the authors who took on the task of expressing their own attitude to the movie and its themes through press organs. The literary postscript to the film has, I think, enriched its content and permitted a more multifaceted interpretation of its purpose.

I sincerely thank the many hundreds of viewers from all parts of our huge country who felt the need to write to me; to share their own impressions, hopes, and doubts; and to communicate the sometimes heart-rending facts of their lives. I still hope to find time to answer each one of them.

In certain letters and certain questions at press conferences, including those abroad, some viewers and journalists are continuing to attempt to "unearth" the specific prototype of Varlam Aravidze, crudely interpreting the Georgian origin of his surname—which, incidentally, does not exist. The opinion is expressed, often in a veiled form, that the creation of "Repentance" at the "Gruziya Film" studio by Georgian authors is almost an expression of the logic of history, and even a national need. They usually explain this "position" by citing the Georgian origin of Stalin and Beriia. If such delusions are sincere, they can still somehow be explained. The idea that Stalin was favorably inclined toward the fellow countrymen of his youth (whose language, incidentally, he did not regard as his native language) is still tenacious.

It is worse when such theorists try to cleanse their own memory by labeling as "aliens" certain errant deceased people—who were as "native" as could be during their lifetime.

In an attempt to create a generalized artistic image of a ruler fostering evil and violence, the movie's authors did not restrict themselves to studying the historical experience of a single country or a single nation. It is probably for this reason that the collective image of the dictator has been comprehensible to viewers from various continents.

As I attended the premieres of "Repentance" in 17 countries, I could see for myself that the majority of foreign viewers are attracted to the movie precisely by the sense of reliving certain pages of their own history and by the concern for the fate of general human values. "Repentance" would hardly have been deemed the best movie of the year in distant Colombia if it had been seen only as "a foreign director settling scores with his tyrant compatriot," as some of our viewers contend.

Again I hear the question: Is it coincidental that the movie was shot in Georgia?

I answer: No, it is not coincidental. Let me explain: The movie could have been made in any of the country's movie studios. It was long overdue. There was no shortage of experts. But there was a tremendous shortage of trust in them.

Georgian television was entrusted with commissioning such a movie. I, as director, was entrusted with implementing my artistic idea. You cannot call the atmosphere of trust prevailing in Georgia coincidental.

Finally, our Soviet viewer was entrusted with interpreting for himself the events of the movie. Every viewer! Every reader! In this way the responsibility borne by those whom the viewers and readers themselves trust has grown to an exceptional degree.

So perhaps their trust should not be abused? Perhaps the time has come to give up unsavory attempts to seek national roots in the need to repent? In that case the author of the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA article (4 February this year) would have lost the desire to bother to "discover" descendants of Varlam in modern Tbilisi and would not have followed a false trail of prototypes for "Repentance."

Evil, like good, is an extra-national category.

Burlatskiy on Khrushchev, Role in History
PM241618 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian 24 Feb 88 p 14

[Fedor Burlatskiy article: "Khrushchev: Sketches for a Political Portrait"]

[Text] Khrushchev and his times: an indisputably important period, and perhaps one of the most complex in our history; important, because it has close echoes in the restructuring now taking place in the country and in the present process of democratization. Complex, because it

is a question of a decade which was at first called "glorious," but later censured as a period of voluntarism and subjectivism. It was the time of the 20th and 22d party congresses, reflections of the bitter political struggles that determined the country's new course. Under N.S. Khrushchev the first steps were taken toward reviving Leninist principles and purifying the ideals of socialism. Then, too, the transition began from the "cold war" to peaceful coexistence, and a window was once again opened onto the modern world. At that abrupt turning point in history society took a deep breath of the air of renewal, and choked... either from too much oxygen, or not enough.

For a long time, a very long time, it was customary not to speak of those stormy years, as if someone's hand had torn a whole chapter clean out of our annals. For nearly 20 years the name Khrushchev was taboo. But life will come into its own. In the report on the 70th anniversary of October, delivered by M.S. Gorbachev, we heard the long awaited words about those times—what was done then, what was not done or done wrongly; what survived into the eighties and what was swept away and lost in the period of stagnation.

So what are the complex and contradictory features of the individual with whom we associate a turning point in our recent history?... I do not seek to answer all the questions that have accumulated; I wish merely to share my personal reminiscences and a few opinions suggested by comparing the present and the past. (Footnote) (The author of the article, who was working on the party's central apparatus in the sixties, often accompanied N.S. Khrushchev on his trips abroad.)

Who makes whom—does history make the individual, or does the individual make history? I have thought and written a great deal about such dissimilar and opposite political figures of the 20th century as Lenin and Stalin, Mao Zedong and Deng Xiaoping.... But to this day I cannot give an entirely clear answer to this question.

Remember what Bulgakov says: How can we speak of human free will, when we cannot have a plan covering at least a thousand years or so? And: A brick does not fall onto a man's head by accident—everything is predetermined. We too, in our youth, were instilled with faith in predetermination, though admittedly it was given a scientific name—natural law. Perhaps it came from Hegel: That which is real is reasonable. Which means, what was, was bound to be. It was only with age and experience that we began to understand the many possible options in history. History includes various possibilities, various chessmen take part in the game. The pawn reaches the last row and becomes a queen. Or the queen falls into a trap and falls victim to the pawn.... I will not launch into a discussion of the problem of "the people and the individual." Ultimately it is the social and moral impulses emanating from the people that determine the face of the era. But in a specific period a major historical personality also makes a tremendous impact on it. Be

that as it may, one thing is obvious: A politician, especially a country's leader, not only acts as an instrument of history, but influences events and destinies in the most direct way.

How did it come about that after Stalin, it was Khrushchev who came to lead the country? Stalin appeared to have done everything possible to "purge" the party of all his opponents—real and imagined, "right" and "left." In the fifties a supposed aphorism of his was passed from mouth to mouth: "If you have a man, you have a problem; no man—no problem." As a result seemingly the most loyal, the most reliable survived. How did Stalin fail to see in Khrushchev the man who would dig a grave for his cult?

In his last years, not long before his death, Stalin consigned Molotov and Mikoyan to disfavor, probably preparing for them the same fate that befell the other leaders who were destroyed with their help and support. The creation at the 19th congress of the CPSU Central Committee Presidium, replacing the Politburo, which had a narrower composition, was a step toward "picking off" the next generation of comrades in arms who had outstayed their time. But Stalin—paradoxically!—did not "have it in for" Khrushchev.

An old man's blindness? Probably not. Niccolo Machiavelli, that brilliant unmasker of tyranny, once said: "Brutus would have become Caesar, if he had pretended to be a fool." I think Khrushchev somehow managed to pretend to be a very pliable person, without any special ambitions. It was said that during the long all-night parties at the nearby dacha in Kuntsevo where the leader lived for the last 30 years, Khrushchev used to dance the gopak. At that time he went about in a Ukrainian smock, playing the "genuine Cossack," remote from any claims to power, a reliable performer of another's will. But evidently even then Khrushchev was harboring protests deep within himself. This surfaced immediately after Stalin's death.

It was not by chance that Khrushchev came to power, yet at the same time it was by chance. It was not by chance, because he expressed the current in the party which, in different conditions and probably in different ways, was represented by such dissimilar figures as Dzerzhinskiy, Bukharin, Rykov, Rudzutak, and Kirov. They were the advocates of the development of the NEP [New Economic Policy] and democratization, the opponents of coercive measures in industry and agriculture, and even more so in culture. Despite the cruel Stalinist repressions, this current never died out. In this sense Khrushchev's arrival on the scene was only natural.

But of course, there was also a large element of chance here. If Malenkov had come to an agreement with Beria, if the "Stalinist guard" had rallied in 1953, rather than in

June 1957, Khrushchev would not have been leader. Our entire history could have followed a rather different course. It is hard for us to admit it, but in fact everything hung by a thread.

All the same, history made the right choice. It was a response to the real problems of our life. The countryside, which was increasingly reduced to poverty and was basically half-ruined; the technically backward industry; the acute housing shortage; the population's low living standard; millions of people held in prisons and camps; the country's isolation from the outside world—all this required a new policy and radical changes. And Khrushchev arrived as—precisely!—the people's hope, the precursor of a New Age.

At that time everything associated with the 20th CPSU Congress deeply moved us. How did Khrushchev dare to deliver the report on Stalin, knowing that the vast majority of delegates would be against the revelations? Where did he find the courage and the confidence in eventual success? This was one of the very rare cases in history when a political leader put his personal power, and even his life, on the line for the sake of higher social objectives. There was not a single figure in the post-Stalin leadership who would have dared to deliver such a report on the personality cult. Khrushchev, and only Khrushchev, in my view, could do it—so boldly, so emotionally, and in many respects with so little thought. It took someone with Khrushchev's nature—desperation to the point of adventurism; it took someone who had passed through the trials of suffering, fear, and time-serving to take such a step. His own assessment of the moment, heard during a meeting with foreign guests, is certainly interesting:

"I am often asked how I dared to deliver that report at the 20th congress. We trusted that man for so many years! We raised him up. We created the cult. And then to take that risk... But since I was elected first secretary, I had to tell the truth, it was my duty; to tell the truth about the past, whatever it cost me and whatever risk it entailed for me. It was Lenin who taught us that a party that is not afraid to tell the truth will never perish. We learned the lessons of the past and we wanted the other fraternal parties to learn those lessons too, and then our common victory would be ensured."

But of course, it was not only a matter of the sense of duty that the first secretary spoke of. I often heard Khrushchev reminiscing about Stalin. They were lengthy, reflective monologues, often lasting many hours, a kind of conversation with himself, with his conscience. He was deeply wounded by Stalinism. There was a mixture of everything here: mystical fear of Stalin, who was capable of destroying anyone for one false step, gesture, or look, and horror at the innocently shed blood. There was a sense of personal guilt and the longing to protest, built up over the centuries, which burst out like steam from a cauldron... In this respect his speech at the

Kremlin banquet attended by participants in the conference of representatives of communist and workers' parties in 1960 is characteristic.

The older generation will, of course, remember this strong-willed personality, but the younger generation has probably never even seen a picture of him. At that time he was already over 60, but he looked very strong, mobile, and cheerful to the point of mischievousness. His broad face with its two warts and his huge bald skull, his large snub nose and his protruding ears could easily have belonged to a peasant from the middle-Russian countryside. This impression of being, so to speak, of the common people was intensified by his thick-set, full figure and his long arms, which were almost continually gesticulating. Only his eyes, small, blue-gray eyes with a keen gaze, eyes that radiated now kindness, now imperiousness and anger—only, I repeat, his eyes revealed the purely political man who had passed through fire and water and was capable of the most abrupt changes of direction.

That is how I saw him then and that is how I remember him, although what most attracted me was the speech itself. What I heard then he repeated in my presence at least twice more in a different atmosphere, more private, in the presence of only a few people. But the surprising thing is that he repeated this story almost word for word.

"When Stalin died, we members of the Central Committee leadership went to the nearby dacha in Kuntsevo. He was lying on the sofa, and there were no doctors there. In the last months of his life Stalin seldom resorted to the assistance of doctors. He feared them; perhaps Beria had frightened him or else he himself believed that the doctors were weaving plots against him and the other leaders. At that time he was being treated by a major from the bodyguard, who was once a veterinary officer. He telephoned the news of Stalin's death..."

"We stood around the dead body, hardly talking, each thinking his own thoughts. Then we began to disperse. We got into cars in twos. Malenkov and Beria went first, then Molotov and Kaganovich. Then Mikoyan said to me: 'Beria has gone to Moscow to seize power.' And I said to him: 'While that scum is around, none of us can feel safe.' And at that moment the idea that Beria must be removed first of all took firm root in my mind. But how could I start discussions with the other leaders?..."

"Time passed, and I began calling on the Presidium members one by one. The most dangerous was Malenkov; he was friends with Lavrentii [Beria]. Well, I went to him; this is how it is, I said, while he is at liberty and holds the security organs in his hands, all our hands are tied. There is no knowing what he might do at any moment, what trick he might pull. You see, I said, for some reason he's bringing the special divisions up to Moscow.

"And I must give Georgiy his due—he supported me on this matter and surmounted his personal relationship. Evidently he himself was afraid of his friend. At that time Malenkov was chairman of the Council of Ministers and conducted the Central Committee Presidium sessions. In a word, he had plenty to lose, but at the end of our conversation he said: 'Yes, you're right, it's inevitable. Only it must be done in such a way as not to make things worse.'

"Then I went to Voroshilov. Klim Yefremovich is sitting here, he remembers. I had to spend a long time talking with him. He was very worried that everything might be ruined. Am I right, Klim?"

"Yes, yes," Kliment Yefremovich loudly confirmed. "As long as there was no war," he added, for some reason, not entirely to the point.

"Well, as for the war, that's a separate conversation," the first secretary observed. "So then I went to Kaganovich, I explained it all to him, and he said to me: 'Whose side is the majority on? Who is for whom? Won't anyone support him?' But when I told him about all the others, he agreed too.

"So I went to the session. Everyone sat down, but no Beria. Well, I thought, he's found out. We'll pay for it, in that case. There's no knowing where we will be tomorrow. But then he came in, carrying his briefcase. I immediately guessed what he had in there! I too had something in reserve in case of such an eventuality..."

Here the speaker slapped the right-hand pocket of his jacket, and went on:

"Beria sat down, spread himself out, and asked: 'Well, what's on the agenda today? Why have we met so unexpectedly?' I prodded Malenkov with my foot and whispered: 'Open the session, give me the floor.' Malenkov blanched; I saw he was incapable of opening his mouth. So I jumped up and said: 'There is one item on the agenda. The antiparty, splittist activity of imperialist agent Beria. There is a proposal to drop him from the Presidium and from the Central Committee, expel him from the party, and hand him over to the court martial. Who is "in favor"?' And I raised my hand first. All the others followed suit. Beria went green—and reached for his briefcase. But I grabbed the briefcase and snatched it away! You're kidding, I said! Drop it! And I pressed a button. Two officers from Moskalenko's military garrison ran in (I had come to an understanding with them beforehand). I ordered them: 'Take this vermin, this traitor to the Motherland, and take him to the proper place.' Beria started to mumble something... Yet he was such a hero when it came to grabbing other people by the scruff of the neck and putting them up against the wall. Well, you know the rest..."

"Now, I want to drink," and here he picked up a glass, "to such things never happening again, anywhere. We ourselves washed out that filthy stain and we will do everything to create guarantees against such phenomena in future. I want to assure you, comrades, that we will create such guarantees, and together we will march on, to the heights of communism!"

I have heard Khrushchev describe his understanding of his role in our country's history. He used to say that Lenin was the organizer of the revolution and founder of the party and state, while Stalin, despite his errors, was the man who ensured victory in the bloody war against fascism. Khrushchev saw it as his own mission to give the Soviet people peace and prosperity. He spoke of this repeatedly as the main aim of his activity.

The problem, however, was that he was unclear about the means of fulfilling these goals. For all his radicalism, he rejected criticism from Palmiro Togliatti, who advised him to seek the roots of the personality cult in the system that had grown up, although Togliatti did not, of course, raise the question of replacing socialism by capitalism, but had in mind a change in the regime of personal power itself.

The thirst for novelty and an energetic nature were characteristic features of Khrushchev. A broad program of restoration of agriculture, the creation of the regional economic councils, intensive housing construction, the retooling of industry. The passport system in the countryside, pension provision for peasants, increased wages for low-paid categories of working people. The preparation of the new party program, the renewal of fundamental laws, the change in the principles and style of relations with the West. Even the famous corn saga... It all reflected the quest for his own paths and solutions, his irrepressible social energy. Khrushchev's time was steeped in spiritual renewal, although this process bore the clear imprint of a past age and was contradictory and often ineffective.

It was Khrushchev who, on his own initiative, set the task of creating firm guarantees against recurrences of the personality cult. He waged an uncompromising struggle for this inside the country and in the international arena, and did not count the cost that such a struggle could entail in relations with various countries belonging to the socialist camp.

Khrushchev attached the main significance to the ideological aspect of the matter, the need to expose the personality cult in full and tell the truth about the crimes of the thirties and other periods. But alas, this truth was itself partial and incomplete. From the first Khrushchev came up against the problem of personal responsibility, because many people in the party knew about the role he himself played in the persecution of cadres both in the Ukraine and in the Moscow party organization. Without telling the truth about himself, he could not tell the whole truth about others. Therefore the information

about the responsibility of various individuals, not to mention Stalin's own responsibility, for the crimes committed was one-sided and often equivocal. It was dependent on political expediency. For instance, while exposing V. Molotov and L. Kaganovich at the 22d CPSU Congress for the massacre of cadres in the thirties, Khrushchev kept quiet about the participation of A. Mikoyan, who subsequently became his reliable ally. In speaking of the thirties Khrushchev carefully avoided the period of collectivization, because he was personally involved in the excesses of that time.

Khrushchev tried to form a common attitude to the Stalin cult in all the members of the Central Committee Presidium. On his instructions, each representative of the leadership who spoke at the 22d congress had to define his attitude to this matter of principle. After the congress, however, it turned out that many of those who had fulminated against the personality cult found it easy to revise their positions and return, basically, to their former views.

The question of guarantees against a repetition anywhere of the personality cult and its negative consequences took up much time in the preparation of the party program. I took part in that work. I remember, for instance, the drafting of the memorandum to the CPSU Central Committee Presidium on the transition from the dictatorship of the proletariat to the state of the whole people, which was of great significance, because the stereotype of the dictatorship of the proletariat was used in the thirties to justify repressions. The memorandum was sent by O.V. Kuusinen and caused a real storm among many leaders. I was in Kuusinen's office when one member of the leadership shouted at him over the telephone: "How could you encroach on the holy of holies of Leninism—the dictatorship of the proletariat?" It was only thanks to Khrushchev's energetic support that this idea found its way into the party program.

One practical conclusion, talking about the past, was associated with the more consistent implementation of the principle of cadre replaceability. This question caused more disputes than anything else. The idea of cadre rotation, which originated from the first secretary himself, underwent a series of changes. At least 10 formulations were drawn up in the attempt to express it in appropriate form. Khrushchev wanted to set up at least some kind of guarantee against the excessive concentration of power in one person's hands, against leaders' "outstaying their time," and against the aging of cadres at every level, from the primary organizations to the top echelon. As for the primary organization, that did not prove particularly contentious. But opinions differed radically on the question of rotation at the top. On this point even he, with his prestige, stubbornness, and persistence, had to yield.

The initial draft enshrined principles whereby it was possible to be on the top leadership for no more than two terms. This led to stormy protests from the younger

leaders. It seemed to them to be extremely unfair for representatives of the older generation who had already "done their time" to try to limit their opportunities. In the next draft two terms gave way to three, but even this formula was rejected. In the final text the whole intention—to create a new procedure for the replacement of cadres—was reworked beyond recognition.

The problem of guarantees against a regime of personal power met with an insuperable obstacle—the limited political sophistication of Khrushchev himself and his generation of leaders. Theirs was largely a patriarchal culture, drawn from traditional ideas of leadership within the framework of the peasant household. Paternalism, interference in all kinds of affairs and relations, the infallibility of the patriarch, intolerance of differing opinions—all this made up the typical set of age-old ideas about power in Russia.

In this respect the events that followed the June 1957 plenum were characteristic. At this plenum, as is known, the representatives of the old "Stalinist guard," by means of a so-called "arithmetical majority," sought Khrushchev's expulsion. As a result of a vote in the CPSU Central Committee Presidium a decision was adopted to relieve him of the post of first secretary. This decision was, however, overturned thanks to the efforts of ardent Khrushchev supporters. Marshal G.K. Zhukov played an outstanding role in defeating the Stalinists. It was said at the time that during the CPSU Central Committee Presidium session Zhukov flung in these people's faces the historic remark: "The Army is against this decision, and not one tank will move from the spot without my orders." This remark eventually cost him his political career.

Soon after the June plenum Khrushchev managed to relieve G.K. Zhukov of his post as member of the CPSU Central Committee Presidium and USSR defense minister. This was done in the traditional spirit of the time—while the marshal was on a foreign trip. He was not given the slightest opportunity to explain himself, just as the party and people were not given the necessary explanation for the removal from the political arena of the outstanding military leader of the Great Patriotic War. The reason for his removal was also traditional—fear of a strong man.

Moreover a considerable part was played by a certain weakness of Khrushchev as a leader. He had long since acquired the reputation of a man who goes about in "worn-out slippers." His inability to judge cadres was also observed as early as the period of his work in Kiev, and later in Moscow. He was always inclined to trust flatterers rather than the true supporters of his reforming transformations. That is why he surrounded himself with people like N. Podgornyy, for instance, people who hung on his every word and were ready to carry out any instructions of his. That is why he was not very impressed by self-sufficient, large-scale personalities and

independent natures. Khrushchev was too sure of himself to seek support in others, and that was one reason for his downfall. People who, deep down, did not share his reforming views deemed them to be a manifestation of incompetence or even stupidity, and at the first convenient opportunity got rid of him...

True, at one time Khrushchev was drawn toward the more educated cadres in the party apparatus. Suffice it to recall his attitude toward D. Shepilov, whom he promoted to the posts of Central Committee secretary and foreign minister. But Shepilov's conduct during the CPSU Central Committee June (1957) Plenum turned Khrushchev against "these intellectuals" for good.

Khrushchev's relations with the intelligentsia were also affected by his haste, his desire to intervene in every issue and resolve it quickly. Here he was often the plaything of self-interested advisers and sometimes even covert opponents who were planning his downfall. I remember well that his visit to the art exhibition at the Manege was provoked by a specially prepared catalog. It said little about the problems of art, but cited genuine or invented remarks by writers and artists about Khrushchev, calling him the "jester on the throne," the "corn man," the "chatterbox." Driven to his wits' end, Khrushchev set off for the Manege to give the artists a piece of his mind. By the same method Khrushchev's covert opponents inveigled him into the L. Pasternak episode, secured, through him, A. Nesmeyanov's removal from the post of president of the USSR Academy of Sciences in favor of Lysenko, and set him against many representatives of literature, art, and science.

A man goes farthest when he does not know where he is going, the ancients used to say. But then his march is meandering and uneven—now he forges rapidly ahead, now he falls back drastically. That is how many of Khrushchev's economic and social reforms looked.

Economic policy was one of the most vulnerable areas of his activity. He saw the task mainly as one of changing the methods of economic leadership at apparatus level—in the Gosplan, the regional economic councils, and the ministries, but he did not recognize the significance of profound structural reforms which change working and living conditions for the actual producers—workers, peasants, and the scientific and technical intelligentsia.

This approach had a particularly unfavorable effect on preparations for the 1961 party program. The most contentious issue was the proposal to incorporate in the program statistical material on the country's economic development and the course of economic competition in the world arena. This proposal was submitted to one of the sessions by A. Zasyadko, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Scientific Economic Council. The report he presented within the framework of a working party seemed to all the participants to be frivolous and unscientific. Calculations on the rate of

development of the Soviet economy and the U.S. economy were more or less plucked out of the air—they expressed wishes, not reality.

But Zasyadko himself easily put an end to the debate that had flared up. He opened the first page of a blue-covered booklet containing a typescript of approximately 80 pages, and pointed to the resolution: "To be incorporated in the program," and the familiar signature of the first secretary. Thus statistical calculations showing how we would catch up and overtake the United States in the eighties were incorporated in the party program. Passions ran high, but, as the saying goes, ambition is not enough, you need ammunition, too.

But it is necessary to try to imagine the general spirit of the time. Although not many people believed in Zasyadko's figures, we had plenty of enthusiasm and optimism. And these feelings were by no means built on sand, everyone was convinced that the new program opened a stage of major structural transformations and developments—otherwise there was no point in adopting and approving a new program. Not even Khrushchev's departure stopped the work. A CPSU Central Committee plenum on economic reform was held in September 1965, after all. But Brezhnev's negative attitude to it nullified the efforts of the preceding era.

Matters were even worse when it came to transformations in the sphere of state administration and the structure of party leadership. Who "fed" Khrushchev the idea of dividing party obkoms and raykoms into industrial ones and agricultural ones? Intuitively, I am convinced that it was done not without malice—in order to decisively undermine his prestige among party leaders.

These errors were laid at Khrushchev's door at the CPSU Central Committee October (1964) Plenum. At this plenum a strange symbiosis of political forces was formed—from advocates of consistent progress along the path of the 20th congress to conservatives and crypto-Stalinists, they all rallied against the leader who had helped the majority of them "to the top." Subsequent events left no room for doubt that Khrushchev was removed not so much for voluntarism as for his insatiable thirst for change. The slogan of "stability" put forward by his successors delayed the urgently needed reforms for a long time. The very word "reform," as well as any mention of the 20th congress, became dangerous, and cost many supporters of this course their political careers.

Time has not dispelled the countless myths that gathered around Khrushchev's name in our country and abroad. Sharing the fate of other reformers, Khrushchev did not win objective recognition in the mass consciousness. The people who once elevated Ivan the Terrible and condemned Boris Godunov could not accept, after Stalin, a public figure lacking in mystical magic, earthy and fallible, subject to errors and delusions. During the "thaw" period a remark about Stalin was attributed to

Sholokhov: "Of course there was a cult, but there was a personality too." This was a veiled reproach to Khrushchev as a far less significant figure. A reproach to the man who, like Shakespeare's Claudius, seized the crown that fell at his feet.

Meanwhile, in Western countries, Nikita Khrushchev was put on a level with John Kennedy and Pope John XXIII. The departure of these leaders from the political arena, for various reasons, was viewed as the cause of the deterioration in the international climate in the late sixties. A great many books came out devoted to analyzing "Khrushchevism" as a new current in socialism.

You could say: A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country—but that would be inaccurate. This is a more profound and complex matter. Ernst Neizvestnyy, with whom Khrushchev conducted his dashing polemics at the Manege, perhaps came closer than anyone else to an assessment of Khrushchev. The monument that the sculptor created on Khrushchev's grave—a bronze head on a background of black and white marble slabs—successfully symbolized the contradictoriness of the "thaw" and its central character.

Now, nearly a quarter of a century later, in comparing the periods before and after October 1964, we can see more clearly Khrushchev's strength and weakness. His main merit was that he crushed Stalin's personality cult. This proved irreversible, despite all the cowardly attempts to set up the pedestal in its former place. They did not work. Which means that the plowing was deep enough. And that means that the plowman did not labor in vain. The courageous decision to rehabilitate many Communists and nonparty people who were subjected to repressions and executions in the period of the personality cult restored justice, truth, and honor in the life of the party and state. A mighty blow, if not in every respect effective and bold, was struck against overcentralism, bureaucracy, and bureaucratic arrogance.

In Khrushchev's time the foundations were laid for a breakthrough in the development of agriculture—purchase prices were increased, the tax burden was reduced drastically, new technologies began to be used. The opening up of the virgin lands, for all its shortcomings, played a part in providing the population with food. Khrushchev tried to point the countryside toward foreign experience and the first agricultural revolution. Even his enthusiasm for corn was dictated by good intentions, although accompanied by naive extremes. Gigantism in the countryside and the reduction in farmstead plots also had a bad effect.

Let us recall that Khrushchev's name is associated with major achievements in the sphere of science and technology, which made it possible to lay the foundations for achieving strategic parity. To this day everyone can still see the meeting between Yuriy Gagarin and Khrushchev, which marked our country's breakthrough into space. Peaceful coexistence, proclaimed at the 20th CPSU

Congress, after undergoing a shock in the period of the Caribbean crisis, became an increasingly firm platform for agreements and businesslike compromises with the West. The Helsinki Final Act, which consolidated the results of World War II and proclaimed new international relations, economic cooperation, and the exchange of information, ideas, and people, has its roots in the era of the "thaw."

At that time the party embarked on the solution of many social problems. The living standard of the population in the cities and the countryside began to improve gradually. However, the planned economic and social reforms misfired. A serious blow was struck against the reformers' hopes by the tragic events in Hungary in 1956. But not the least important part was played by Nikita Sergeyevich's self-confidence, his lack of concern for questions of theory and political strategy. "Khrushchevism" as a prospectus for the renewal of socialism did not work. To use the favorite metaphor of the first secretary's main opponent, Mao Zedong, Khrushchev walked on two feet: One was stepping boldly into a new era, while the other was inextricably bogged down in the quagmire of the past.

In answer to the question why the reforms suffered defeat in the sixties, one could also say this: Conservative forces were able to prevail over the reformers because the administrative apparatus and the entire society were not yet ready for radical changes. But that answer is too general. It is necessary to try to clarify what it was that the conservatives took advantage of.

In my view, one of the mistakes was the fact that the quest for a prospectus for reforms and means of implementing them was based on traditional administrative and even bureaucratic methods. Khrushchev usually issued instructions to "study" particular problems—economic, cultural, political—to the ministries and departments, that is, to the administrative apparatus itself, which was to limit its own power. But the apparatus always found a way to protect itself against control, through direct, indirect, or ambiguous decisions.

More or less successful reforms, both in socialist and capitalist countries, have usually been planned by a group of experts, chiefly scientists and public figures, working under the leadership of the country's leader. This was the case, for instance, in Hungary, Yugoslavia, and China. In Japan I met with Professor Okita, who is regarded as the author of the Japanese "miracle." In the FRG a plan of reforms was drawn up at one time by Professor Erhard, who subsequently became the country's chancellor.

The second thing is that "the people were silent" [quotation from Pushkin's "Boris Godunov"]. Now, on the basis of the experience of glasnost, we can see particularly clearly how little was done to inform people about the past, about the real problems, about the planned solutions, to say nothing of involving the broadest strata

of the public in the struggle for reforms. How many times, recently, have I heard: "But in what way was Khrushchev better than Stalin? Under Stalin at least there was order, they jailed the bureaucrats and the prices came down." It was no accident that at the time of the CPSU Central Committee October (1964) Plenum virtually a majority throughout society heaved a sigh of relief and hopefully awaited changes for the better.

One last lesson. It concerns Khrushchev himself. This man of keen, innate political intelligence, bold and energetic, could not resist the charms of praise of his own personality. "Our Nikita Sergeyevich!" Was not this the beginning of the fall from grace for the acknowledged fighter against the cult? The limpets drowned him in a sea of flattery and praise, receiving in return high posts, the top awards, bonuses, and titles. And it is no accident that the worse matters were in the country, the louder and more triumphant the chorus of limpets and flatterers lauding the successes of the "great decade."

The ancients used to say: "Character is a man's guiding destiny." Nikita Khrushchev was the victim of his own character, not only the victim of the environment. Haste, rashness, and emotionalism were unconquerable characteristics of his.

One of Khrushchev's assistants told me about an amazing conversation that his boss had with Winston Churchill. It was at the time of the visit to Britain by Khrushchev and Bulganin in 1956. They met with Churchill, as I recall it, at a reception at the Soviet embassy. This is what the old British lion said: "Mr Khrushchev, you are launching great reforms. And that is good! I would only like to advise you not to be in too much of a hurry. It is not easy to cross an abyss in two jumps. You might fall in." I would venture to add on my own account: Nor can you cross an abyss when you do not know which bank you are trying to jump onto.

Fuel and energy complex
Metallurgical complex
Machine building complex
Chemical industry and timber complex
Agro-industrial complex
Social complex (USSR Ministry of Light Industry)
Construction industry complex (USSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry)

Data on industry's work in January this year for **union republics** (including industry under union jurisdiction) is cited below [Columns in the following table represent:

Economic

January Industrial Performance Report

PM241547 Moscow *EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA*
in Russian No 8, Feb 88 (Signed to Press 19 Feb 88) p 20

[USSR State Committee for Statistics report: "On Industry's Work in January 1988"—boldface as published]

[Text] The USSR "Law on the State Enterprise (Association)" came into force 1 January 1988, introducing fundamental changes in the conditions and methods of economic management in the main component of the economy, ensuring greater independence for enterprises, and enhancing their responsibility for the results of economic activity on the basis of full economic accountability [khozraschet] and broad self-management. Industrial enterprises and associations manufacturing 60 percent of the total volume of output and employing 55 percent of industrial production personnel will operate in conditions of full economic accountability and self-financing in 1988.

In January 1988 contract commitments for output deliveries in line with state orders and direct deliveries on the basis of contracts with consumers were fulfilled 98.5 percent by industry as a whole against 96.5 percent in January 1987. Some 16 percent of associations and enterprises failed to cope with their commitments.

The circle of enterprises where state acceptance of output has been introduced was expanded from January 1988. At the 2,200 such enterprises as a whole state acceptance rejected output worth R1.3 billion on first submission during January—9 percent of the total submitted—and output worth R5 million was eventually rejected.

Compared with January last year industrial output growth amounted to 4.7 percent, with an average daily growth of 7.2 percent. [sentence as published]

The fulfillment of contract commitments for output deliveries and rates of growth of output (works, services) in January 1988 by national economic complexes is as follows [Columns in the following table represent: Column A—Percentage fulfillment of contract commitments; Column B—Shortfall in output deliveries, millions of rubles; Column C—Percentage of enterprises failing to fulfill contract commitments; Column D—Actual percentage rate of growth of output (works, services) in comparable prices]:

	A	B	C	D
Fuel and energy complex	98.8	53	29	1.7
Metallurgical complex	99.3	42	20	5.2
Machine building complex	97.8	164	34	11.6
Chemical industry and timber complex	97.9	177	37	5.1
Agro-industrial complex	99.3	60	10	3.2
Social complex (USSR Ministry of Light Industry)	98.2	143	21	2.9
Construction industry complex (USSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry)	98.6	15	20	5.3

Column A—Percentage fulfillment of contract commitments; Column B—Percentage of enterprises failing to fulfill contract commitments; Column C—Actual percentage rate of growth of output (works, services) in comparable prices];

	A	B	C
RSFSR	98.4	18	4.5
Ukrainian SSR	98.5	14	6.7
Belorussian SSR	99.8	6	5.6
Uzbek SSR	97.7	16	-1.2
Kazakh SSR	98.9	13	4.3
Georgian SSR	98.6	9	0.1
Azerbaijan SSR	98.5	15	3.3
Lithuanian SSR	99.8	2	1.2
Moldavian SSR	99.0	16	6.3
Latvian SSR	99.0	9	3.8
Kirghiz SSR	98.0	18	6.6
Tajik SSR	98.4	21	3.6
Armenian SSR	95.0	20	1.2
Turkmen SSR	98.3	12	1.0
Estonian SSR	99.6	6	2.7

Data on the progress of fulfillment of state orders and the production of the most important types of output by national economic complexes are cited below:

Fuel and Energy Complex [subhead]

	Actual in January 1988	Percentage fulfillment of target	January 1988 as percentage of January 1987
Electricity, billion kilowatt-hours	161	100.8	100.8
Oil (including gas condensate), million tonnes	53.2	101	101
Gas, billion cubic meters	67.1	103	107
Coal, million tonnes	67.5	103	100.8

The fuel and energy complex sectors fulfilled the state order for the extraction of the basic types of fuel and energy resources. A total of 595,000 tonnes of oil including gas condensate, 1.8 billion cubic meters of gas, and 2 million tonnes of coal including 1 million tonnes of coking coal was extracted over and above the target.

Metallurgy Complex [subhead]

	Actual in January 1988	Percentage fulfillment of target	January 1988 as percentage of January 1987
Steel, million tonnes	13.9	100.5	103
Rolled ferrous metal products (finished), million tonnes	9.9	100.7	106
Steel pipes, million tonnes	1.7	101	108
Iron ore, million tonnes	21.2	101	101

Metallurgy complex enterprises ensured that they met the state order targets for finished rolled ferrous metal products and steel pipes. Contract discipline improved. At the same time, enterprises under the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy allowed a lag to build up in the

production of efficient cast billets from continuous casting machines, electric steel, cold-drawn sectional steel, and a number of other areas.

Machine-Building Complex [subhead]

	Actual in January 1988	Percentage fulfillment of target	January 1988 as percentage of January 1987
Turbine generators, million kilowatt	1.6	251	294
Large electric machines, thousands	2.1	92	111
Special, specialized, and modular metal cutting machine tools, thousands	3.6	92	102
Metal cutting machine tools with digital program control, thousands	1.6	98	106
Forging and pressing machines with digital program control, units	127	121	148
Instruments, automation equipment, and spare parts, million rubles	102	97	111
Medical equipment and spare parts, million rubles	71.5	102	110
Computer equipment and spare parts, million rubles	419	104	133
Ferrous metal rolling equipment, million rubles	19.6	99.3	149
Petroleum apparatus, million rubles	21.0	93	106
Chemical equipment and spare parts, million rubles	85.8	99.6	124
Industrial equipment and spare parts for light industry and processing sectors of the agro-industrial complex, million rubles	165	94	117
Tractors, million horsepower	4.3	97	102
Agricultural machines, million rubles	320	97	103
Machines and equipment for stockraising and feed production, million rubles	230	98	129
Excavators, thousands	3.2	95	128

In January this year enterprises in the machine-building complex achieved considerably higher output for most types of machines and equipment than in January last year. Production of metal cutting machine tools was R219 million or 10 percent more than in January 1987, and that of forging and pressing machines was R54 million or 15 percent more. But the monthly targets were not met for numerous types of most important products covered by state orders. For example, enterprises under the USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry failed to meet targets for a number of

advanced types of equipment for the retooling of enterprises—metal cutting machine tools with digital program control and special, specialized, and modular machine tools. Enterprises under the USSR Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems produced less than the planned quantity of instruments and automation equipment, digital program control devices, and medical equipment. The shortfall in deliveries of agricultural machines and of machines and equipment for stockraising and feed production to agriculture by enterprises under the USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building amounted to R8 million rubles and more than 1,500 tractors.

Chemical Industry and Timber Complex [subhead]

	Actual in 1988	Percentage fulfillment of target	January 1988 as percentage of 1987
Mineral fertilizers (in 100-percent nutrient equivalent), million tonnes	3.2	102	104
Chemical plant protection agents (in 100-percent active ingredient equivalent) thousand tonnes	27.6	99.8	94
Sulfuric acid, million tonnes	2.6	99.9	106
Caustic soda, thousand tonnes	296	99	105
Chemical fibers and yarns, thousand tonnes	135	102	104
Truck tires, millions	2.3	100.2	104
Car tires, millions	2.0	102	109
Tires for agricultural machines, millions	1.0	99.3	100.3
Medicines, million rubles	273	101	99

	Actual in 1988	Percentage fulfillment of target	January 1988 as percentage of 1987
Mineral fertilizers (in 100-percent nutrient equivalent), million tonnes	3.2	102	104
Chemical plant protection agents (in 100-percent active ingredient equivalent) thousand tonnes	27.6	99.8	94
Commercial lumber (excluding small timber procurements) million trimmed cubic meters	31.6	98	101
Paper, million tonnes, billion sq meters	0.5	102	106
of which newsprint	3.2	102	105

The chemical industry and timber complex industry met its set targets in January and achieved the planned output growth for many of the most important types of products of the complex: Mineral fertilizers, chemical fibers and yarns, synthetic rubber, cinematographic and photographic film, magnetic tapes, rubber-coated webbing belts for conveyors, newsprint, and hard wood-fiber slabs.

At the same time, output of calcinated soda by enterprises under the USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry fell short by more than 14,000 tonnes as a result of unsatisfactory equipment operations at the "Khimprom" Production Associations in Slavyansk and the Crimea and the Lisichansk soda plant. Unsatisfactory work by the Ziminskiy Rayon chemical plant in the production of polyvinyl chloride resins is holding back the work of pipe production units.

There was erratic work by enterprises under the USSR Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry in the production of rubber footwear. The lag that was allowed to build up was particularly great at the Astrakhan rubber footwear plant (84 percent) and Leningrad's "Krasnyy Treugolnik" Production Association (97 percent).

Shortcomings in the work of major timber procurement associations under the USSR Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry like "Dallesprom," "Primorsklesprom," "Irkutsklesprom," and a number of others largely contributed to the fact that the ministry as a whole failed to cope with its commercial lumber targets.

Industry Within the Construction Industry Complex [subhead]

	Actual in January 1988	Percentage fulfillment of target	January 1988 as percentage of January 1987
Cement, million tonnes	11.6	101	102
Asbestos cement sheet (shingles), million standard tiles	732	99.9	98
Asbestos cement pipes and sleeves, thousand km standard pipes	6.8	100.4	98
Soft roofing and insulation materials, million sq meters	171	99.2	103
Window glass, million sq meters	24.8	100.7	100.8

Industry within the construction industry complex met its January targets for the manufacture of cement and window glass. Cement production using the energy-saving "dry" method grew at faster rate.

At the same time, targets were not met for the production of ferroconcrete pressure pipes, soft roofing and insulation materials, building bricks, and shingles. The

Dushanbe combine for asbestos cement articles and the Kaspi cement and shingle combine under the USSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry continue to work unsatisfactorily and failed to deliver about 9 million standard asbestos cement flat tiles against the targets for the month (the delivery shortfall for the sector as a whole amounted to 0.4 million tiles). The following figures describe the production of consumer goods:

	Actual in January 1988	Percentage fulfillment of target	January 1988 as percentage of January 1987
Foodstuffs			
Meat, including Category I subproducts (from state raw material resources), million tonnes	1.1	107	99
Sausage products, thousand tonnes	306	101	102
Butter (from state raw material resources), thousand tonnes	83	108	109
Wholemilk products in milk equivalent (from state raw material resources) million tonnes	2.6	103	104
Commodity edible fish products (including canned fish), thousand tonnes	517	112	99.6
Full fat cheese, thousand tonnes	55	103	105
Margarine products, thousand tonnes	141	99.5	106
vegetable oil (from state raw material resources), thousand tonnes	297	100.3	99.1
Confectionery products thousand tonnes	408	102	100.7
Canned food, billion standard cans	1.2	105	104
Light Industry Products			
Cotton textiles, million sq meters	659	100.3	102
Linen, hemp, and jute textiles, million sq meters	81.4	100	103
Woollen textiles, million sq meters	58.1	100.1	102
Silk textiles, million sq meters	171	100.5	108
Knitted articles, million items	150	99.8	100.3
Hosiery, million pairs	170	101	101
Footwear, million pairs	65.8	99.3	97
Nonfood Consumer Goods (excluding light industry goods)			
Television sets, millions	0.7	97	134
of which, color sets	0.4	100.7	184
Refrigerators and freezers, millions	0.5	100.2	111
Motorcycles, thousands	80.5	96	122
Sewing machines, thousands	131	98	115
Washing machines, millions	0.5	94	116
Furniture, billion rubles	0.7	99	107
Automobiles, thousands	107	100	103

The total value of consumer goods produced in January (excluding the cost of alcoholic beverages) amounted to R26 billion (in retail prices), which was R1.4 billion (6 percent) more than in the corresponding period of last year.

Enterprises under the USSR Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine-Building, the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry, the USSR Ministry of the Automotive Industry, the USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, the USSR Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, and other ministries failed to meet the prescribed targets.

Production was less than planned by 59,000 radio receivers, 24,000 television sets, 32,400 washing machines, 31,700 tape recorders, 3,000 sewing machines, and 9,400 vacuum cleaners. A lag was allowed to build up in the manufacture of galvanic cells and batteries, motor cycles, bicycles, and furniture.

According to the January results, 377 enterprises under the USSR Ministry of Light Industry did not ensure fulfillment of contract commitments. The shortfall in

deliveries of output and light industry goods by these enterprises amounted to R143 million. The overall fulfillment of contract commitments was 98.2 percent. The greatest lag was allowed to build up by enterprises under the Ministries of Light Industry in the RSFSR (97.6 percent), Uzbekistan (96.9 percent), Azerbaijan (97.1 percent), Kirghizia (96.2 percent), Tajikistan (97.6 percent), and Armenia (95.8 percent).

Targets were not met for the manufacture of footwear (by 293,000 pairs), including children's footwear (by 98,000 pairs) and pressure-molded plastic and polyurethane footwear (by 42,000 pairs), and of knitwear (by 171,000 items).

Scientific

Soviets To Launch Indian Satellite in March
LD241750 Moscow TASS in English 1715 GMT
24 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 24 TASS—An Indian natural resources satellite, IRSS, will be launched from the Soviet cosmodrome Baykonur in March. This is the

fourth Indian satellite to be launched by a Soviet booster, but it will be the first launching on a commercial basis, the newspaper MOSCOW NEWS reported. Aleksandr Dunayev, head of the Chief Administration for the Development and Use of Space Engineering for the Economy and Research (Glavkosmos) said in an interview to the newspaper that the price for the launching does not reflect real expenditures. It is much lower than prices for such services in the world market. Setting the price we proceeded from the view that this is our first commercial experience of this kind, Dunayev said. We also could not but take into consideration the nature of extremely friendly relations which mark Soviet-Indian cooperation in space for over two decades. Discussing plans of cooperation the sides agreed to set more realistic prices in future.

Soviet specialists had earlier helped India, together with scientists and engineers of other countries build the first range for the launching of meteorological rockets. This was the first step on India's approaches to space. The USSR Academy of Sciences and the Indian Space Research organization later signed an agreement on space cooperation. Indian satellites were put into orbit from the Soviet cosmodrome Kapustin Yar. This was done free of charge.

Indian specialists built the new satellite by themselves at the most contemporary level. It weighs 940 kilograms. The weight of each of the previous satellites of the Bhaskara series was about 300 kilograms. Therefore a more powerful rocket, Vostok, was needed for the launching of the new satellite.

The creation of a working, not an experimental, system of a natural resources satellite is India's great achievement, Dunayev said. Our task is to launch the satellite and guide it for some ten days. After we get convinced that all equipment of the satellite functions normally, the apparatus for the maintenance of the satellite will be turned over to the Indian side.

The Sputnik will work for two or three years. Other such spacecraft are planned to be launched later. More than 50 Indian specialists are employed in checking and other pre-launch operations at Baykonur cosmodrome.

Military

Kulikov Views Army Anniversary, Polish Ties
4U231820 Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI in Polish 20-21 Feb 88 p 4

[NOVOSTI article by Viktor Kulikov, Soviet first deputy minister of defense: "70 Years of Defending Peace and Socialism"]

[Text] The Soviet Armed Forces will celebrate their 70th anniversary on 23 February 1988. For seven decades they have been honorably defending the achievements of the Great October Revolution and guarding peace and socialism.

As they started to build a new life, the working people of Soviet Russia were compelled to defend their revolutionary achievements from both internal and external counterrevolutionary attacks.

Documents on the organization of the Red Army and naval forces were approved as early as the beginning of 1918. On 22 February 1918, following the launching of another offensive by the imperial German forces, a Soviet Government decree signed by Lenin entitled "The Soviet Fatherland is in Danger" was published. It contained an appeal to wage a struggle against interventionist forces.

On the day after its publication, working people began to join the Red Army en masse. Since then, to commemorate the general mobilization of revolutionary forces in defense of the Soviet fatherland and the heroic battles fought by the first units of the Red Army, the 23 February has been celebrated as Red Army and Naval Forces Day.

Thanks to the great effort that was exerted, the offensive launched by the German forces was halted. Shortly afterward the Brest peace treaty was signed, and Soviet Russia was able to end its involvement in the imperialist war and embark on the construction of socialism. This period of peace did not last long, however: Aided by support from international imperialism, domestic counterrevolutionary forces were able to unleash a civil war.

For more than 3 years, a fierce struggle was waged against the White Guard and interventionist forces. Although they experienced an acute shortage of weapons, food, and uniforms, the Red Guard was able to achieve victory in a fierce conflict with the enemies of the revolution and to defend the achievements of the revolution.

During the civil war years soldiers and internationalists from many countries, including Poland, fought side by side with Soviet soldiers. The military deeds of Polish revolutionary units—which formed the basis of the Western infantry division, the First Red Warsaw Regiment and other Polish formations belonging to the Red Army—are a permanent part of the history of those years.

The outcome of the civil war affirmed the significant sociopolitical and spiritual opportunities afforded by socialism. These opportunities, however, were to develop most fully during the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45.

For 1,418 days and nights the Soviet people and the Soviet Armed Forces waged a bitter struggle against the Nazi invader.

The beginning of the war was exceptionally difficult. While forced to retreat because of the aggressor's superior strength, the soldiers of the Red Army fought for

every of inch of native soil, and by doing so they made the enemy suffer heavy losses. This was how Hitler's plans of inflicting a sudden, and crushing defeat on the Soviet Union were dashed.

The first serious defeat suffered by the fascist Wehrmacht took place outside Moscow. The victory of the Soviet Armed Forces at Stalingrad marked a decisive turning-point in the Great Patriotic War. The Nazi occupying forces suffered such heavy losses in the battles fought at Kursk, in the Ukraine west of the Dnepr, and in Belorussia, that they were unable to recover.

The Soviet Army took the strategic initiative and maintained it until the end of the war. During the great strategic operations of 1944-45, it crushed the Nazi war machine.

Following the victory over fascist Germany, the Soviet Union remained faithful to its allies and discharged its commitments by initiating operations against militarist Japan in August 1945. During the course of an offensive that lasted 23 days, its Armed Forces and those of the Mongolian People's Republic crushed the almost million-strong Japanese Army in Kwantung and made an important contribution to the victory over Japan at the end of World War II.

The Red Army crushed 607 and the Anglo-American armies crushed 176 fascist divisions. The Wehrmacht suffered three-quarters of all its losses and lost 75 percent of its aircraft, tanks, and guns on the Soviet-German front. About 7 million Soviet troops took part in the liberation of 13 countries in Europe and in Asia. They liberated a total area of more than 2.2 million square km, which was inhabited by 147 million people. At the same time, the Soviet Army lost more than 1 million troops, 600,000 of which were lost in the liberation of Poland alone.

The peoples of many countries took part in the fight against German fascism and Japanese militarism. Military and partisan units in Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, patriots in Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, and Hungary, and members of resistance movements and the antifascist underground fought selflessly against the Nazi invasion forces. The peoples and armies of the United States, Great Britain, France, China, and other states made a great contribution to victory.

As someone who took part in the liberation of Poland, I must emphasize the heroism displayed by Polish troops and commanders. The blood shed in battle side by side with the Red Army strengthened the Polish-Soviet comradeship-in-arms forged at Lenino in Belorussia, form where the people's Polish Army set out on the road leading back to the fatherland.

The organizational and ideological work carried out by the Polish Workers Party and the efforts made by Polish working people helped to turn the Polish Army into a

mass, regular army. At the end of the war it comprised 440,000 soldiers and officers. The first and second armies of the Polish Army and its armored and air corps fought together with Soviet troops in operations in the Oder-Nysa region, East Prussia, Berlin, and Prague.

The Soviet Union made a large contribution to the creation and strengthening of the Polish Army. During the war years Polish forces received about 700,000 rifles and machineguns, 3,500 artillery guns, more than 1,000 tanks, 1,200 aircraft, 18,000 automobiles, and large amounts of ammunition, fuel, food, and clothing from the Soviet Union. At the request of Polish commanders, thousands of Red Army commanders and ordinary soldiers with specialist skills were transferred to serve in Polish units.

The main driving force behind the victory achieved by the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War, a force that served to inspire and organize it, was the Communist Party, which ensured strongly united political, state, and military leadership, and strong unity in the Army, among the peoples, and at the front and in the rear.

The war ended. During a short period the Soviet Union rebuilt its shattered economy and attained a high rate of development. During these years it was compelled to take determined steps to strengthen its defense capacity, which it viewed as an objective necessity in light of the growing military threat posed by aggressive imperialist circles. In the first years following the war, they invented nuclear blackmail, unleashed the cold war against the Soviet Union and its allies, and set up the aggressive NATO military bloc. Later, imperialist circles heightened tensions by making preparations for a new world war. In response to this, the USSR proceeded to improve its Armed Forces and prepared to repel a possible attack. The Army and Navy were equipped with missiles and weapons, supersonic aircraft, missile-carrying submarines, and other types of modern weapons and military technology. All this considerably increased the power of the Armed Forces. By the early seventies, the Soviet Union had an approximate military balance with the United States. The formation of the Warsaw Pact in 1955 was of major importance in consolidating peace and socialism.

The achievement of military-strategic parity strengthened the USSR's position and that of the socialist countries and all progressive forces in the world. It thwarted aggressive imperialist circles' expectations of victory by means of a nuclear war, and really became a major factor in preventing war.

Nevertheless, the socialist countries see this not as the success of powerful weapons, but as a success by common sense and political realism. They are in favor of solving all thorny international issues solely by peaceful means and with the help of political resources.

The 27th CPSU Congress proposed a political philosophy of peace and a platform of concrete undertakings to achieve it. It stressed that new political thinking is essential today. This thinking incorporates Leninist ideas of peaceful coexistence, of increasing relevance to a world that is in a nuclear-space age and scientific-technological revolution. It takes into account priorities in human values when solving today's most difficult problems.

Since Reykjavik, this new thinking has been translated to practical activity. During the U.S. visit by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev in December 1987, there was a historic breakthrough in the sphere of nuclear arms reductions. A Soviet-U.S. agreement to eliminate intermediate and shorter-range missiles was signed, and the prospects of a 50-percent reduction in USSR and U.S. offensive strategic weapons became closer, provided that the agreement on anti-missile defense is respected during the agreed time period.

The proposals and initiatives of other Warsaw Pact states are also of clear importance for the future of Europe and the entire world. One can certainly say that about the plan to reduce armaments and increase confidence in Europe, presented in the PPR and known as the Jaruzelski Plan.

To reduce international tension and overcome the "crisis of confidence" vis-a-vis the foreign policy of the socialist countries, the leaders of these countries decided to publicize their military doctrine.

By inviting the NATO states to take part in dialogue, the Warsaw Pact states wanted to show that a concrete example is far more convincing than mere declarations.

On what is this doctrine based? The most important task is to prevent nuclear and conventional war. The doctrine is purely defensive and is inseparably connected with the peace policy of the socialist countries. But it does call for a readiness to defend oneself against external aggression. For this reason, the socialist countries have to maintain their Armed Forces at a level necessary to repel any attack on a Warsaw Pact state.

Nevertheless, one of the chief tasks of these Armed Forces, which is reflected in the military doctrine, is to prevent a war. Therefore it is no coincidence that the socialist community does not aim to possess armed forces at a higher level than that necessary for defense. They adhere closely to the size that is sufficient to repel aggression.

For the Soviet Union, its Armed Forces, and particularly its strategic nuclear forces, sufficiency means preventing a nuclear attack even in the most unfavorable situation. As far as conventional resources are concerned, it is sufficient to have enough of these, and a suitable quality thereof, to safeguard the socialist community's collective defense.

In this context, the processes taking place in the USSR are of major importance. The program of accelerated socioeconomic development that was adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress and is being implemented by the Soviet people is aimed at a qualitative change to all aspects of Soviet society.

The restructuring is also serving to consolidate the country's defense capability. Scientific-technological progress and economic development permit timely supplies of modern weapons and combat technology to the Soviet Armed Forces. These supplies are commensurate to the danger of any eventual aggression.

The restructuring taking place in the Army and Navy and which involves all spheres of military life and activity is exerting a positive influence on this process.

By taking part in it, every unit, sub-unit, and ship is energetically removing shortcomings and striving to increase its combat readiness.

Together with the soldiers of the Warsaw Pact states, the Soviet Armed Forces are fulfilling the great duty of defending socialism.

The experience of the fraternal armies in cooperation is increasing, and uniform views about military theory and practice, equipment, and training are taking shape.

The Soviet Armed Forces have traveled a difficult but glorious road over the past 70 years. It is a road of bitter defeats and joyous victories, a road of constantly improving the art of combat and championship. Today, the soldier with the red star is carefully sensitively guarding peace, socialism, and progress just like he did 70 years ago.

Comments on Army History

AU241930 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak
23 Feb 88 p 3

[Article by V. Kulikov, marshal of the Soviet Union: "Safeguarding Peace at All Times"]

[Text] Today, on 23 February, the Land of the Soviets celebrates the Day of the Soviet Army. The Soviet Armed Forces have been valiantly safeguarding and defending the achievements of the Great October, and serving the people loyally and with dedication for 70 years now.

The history of the Soviet Armed Forces began at the same time as the birth of the world's first socialist state. On 28 January 1918, V.I. Lenin signed the Decree of the Council of People's Commissars on the establishment of the workers' and peasants' Red Army, and on 11 February the same year he signed the decree on the establishment of the workers' and peasants' Red Fleet. The buildup of those forces practically began from nothing. "The issue of the Red Army's buildup," Vladimir Ilch

said at the Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (of the Bolsheviks), "was quite new... We proceeded from experience to experience..., searching and experimenting how one could resolve this task in a specific situation. The task was clear. We could not exist without armed defense of the socialist republic."

After the victory over the internal counterrevolution and foreign interventionists, the Soviet state consolidated its internal situation as well as its international position, and acquired the possibility to concentrate its strength on the peaceful construction of the economy and culture. However, encirclement by hostile capitalist states dictated the necessity to resolve not only construction, but also defense-related tasks. This was all the more necessary, since the successes of the Soviet Union in building socialism would not let this reactionary imperialist circles rest. In 1938 Japanese militarists invaded Soviet territory in the area of Lake Hasan. In 1939 there was another aggressive action by the Japanese militarists on the River Halhin-Gol against the Mongolian People's Republic, which was a friend of the USSR. The Red Army, together with the troops of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Army, beat back the aggressors' attack.

The war foisted upon us by fascism was a tough test of the viability of the socialist system, the strength of the multinational Soviet state and its Armed Forces, and the strength of the Soviet people's patriotic spirit. In terms of its bloodiness, extent, and intensity it was an unprecedented struggle for the freedom and independence of the fatherland of October, to rid mankind the threat of fascist subjugation. The Soviet Union passed the test of fire and the sword.

After the victory over fascist Germany, the USSR, true to its alliance obligations, entered the war against militarist Japan in August 1945. In a short time the Soviet Armed Forces defeated the main strike group of the Japanese ground forces, the Kwantung Army, a matter which predetermined the military collapse of militarist Japan. The USSR Armed Forces fulfilled their liberation mission in the Far East, when they chased out the Japanese occupiers from northeast China (Manchuria) and northern Korea.

The war revealed the invincibility of socialism, its inexhaustible sociopolitical, economic, and intellectual potential. Our victory was the most momentous victory, the victory of the Armed Forces, of Soviet military science and military art.

The war ended. It seemed that the prospect of just, solid, and lasting peace had opened up for mankind. But the celebrations of the great victory over fascism throughout the world were not even quite over when, reactionary military circles headed by the United States, launched preparations for new wars. They forgot the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements and established aggressive military blocs, oriented against the socialist countries. Thanks to

the measures taken in the political and military spheres, the intentions of imperialism—to settle accounts with socialism—were not realized. The achievement of military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States, between the Warsaw Pact and NATO was a historic success. This parity strengthened the positions of the USSR, the socialist countries, and all progressive forces, and thwarted the hopes of the aggressive circles of imperialism for victory in a nuclear world war.

The 27th CPSU Congress has become an important milestone in the USSR's struggle for peace and security, for the consolidation of the achievements of socialism. That congress worked out a new concept of international security, unveiled its basic foundations, offered mankind a political philosophy and a platform for concrete actions to achieve it, showed that eliminating the nuclear threat requires new thinking. Its essence is realization of the necessity to abandon wars and the policy of strength in international relations, and to seek different approaches to the issues of war and peace.

The publication of the military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact member states is of great importance for the easing of tension. The main special feature of the Warsaw Pact's military doctrine, and of the military doctrine of every one of its members, is that it is subordinated to solving the cardinal task facing mankind, the task of not permitting war, neither nuclear nor conventional war. Another special feature is its exclusively defensive character. The allied states will never be the first to use nuclear weapons, they will never, under any circumstances, start military actions against any state or any group of states, provided they themselves are not the subject of an armed attack.

In view of the real danger that imperialism will unleash a new world war, the military doctrine orients the Soviet Armed Forces toward the need to maintain its combat potential with a high level alertness. "As long as there exists the danger of war, as long as social retaliation [revans] remains the core of the strategy and militarist plans of the West," Mikhail Gorbachev stated in his "October and Restructuring; the Revolution Continues" speech, "in the future we will also do everything necessary to maintain defensive forces at a level which excludes the military superiority of imperialism over socialism."

Restructuring is now being carried out in the Armed Forces as well as throughout the country. What is involved in particular is to ensure a real advance regarding improving the quality of combat and political readiness, the general strengthening of strict order, increasing the combat readiness of formations, units, and ships.

In some cases, however, this is being prevented by ossified, retarding elements. Checks exposed great shortcomings in combat readiness, organization, and the

performance of combat duties. This required the introduction of the strictest possible order and the strengthening of military discipline with the aim of increasing the combat readiness of the Army and the fleet. There is immense work ahead of us, aimed at improving the quality of troops and the fleet. Restructuring does not apply only to individual issues, but to all spheres of the life and activity of the Armed Forces, of every soldier.

The Soviet Armed Forces have traveled a great road in 70 years. It was a road of tough tests and great victories, the road of systematic perfection and strengthening. Today the Soviet Army and the naval fleet have modern weapons and technology at their disposal, they have well-trained personnel, trained command and political cadres which are devoted to the people. Everyone is fulfilling his duties toward the fatherland with honor and, together with the troops of the fraternal socialist countries, they are vigilantly guarding the historic achievements of the people of their countries.

Chernavin on Anniversary, 'Defensive' Doctrine
PM241247 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 21 Feb 88 p 1

[Own correspondent D. Mysyakov interview with Fleet Admiral V.N. Chernavin, commander in chief of the Navy and USSR deputy defense minister, under the rubric "70th Anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy": "Clear Channel"; date and place not given]

[Text] [Mysyakov] Commander in Chief! We have grown accustomed to thinking that the Soviet Armed Forces are provided with everything they need for the reliable defense of the motherland. The Army and Navy possess modern equipment and the latest armaments. Yet it is no secret that their creation takes great efforts. Designers, engineers, and science-and-production collectives work on defense. Sizeable resources are spent...

[Chernavin] But there is no other way out. Many of us military men dream of the time when the arms race will finally end and when there will be no need for new, unprecedented tanks or missile complexes. We all want this time to come quicker. But dreams are dreams and reality dictates its own laws. I and other officers had to say goodbye to the usual familiar diesel submarines and cope with new nuclear-powered submarines. At that time nuclear power was only in its infancy. Its development promised many benefits for the national economy. First nuclear-powered vessels appeared and then the first power station with an industrial rating began producing power.

The same thing also happened, incidentally, in the United States. Only quite different aims were pursued there. We were concerned about defense, whereas they were concerned about offense. In the course of World War II U.S. strategists zealously engaged in compiling plans for extensive aggression against our country using weapons of mass destruction. Over the years their desire

for military superiority has not slackened, unfortunately. After the war the territories of the Soviet Union and other socialist states were encircled by a series of army, navy, and air bases. Attack-carrier formations and, shortly after, nuclear-powered missile submarines occupied the waters. This is not simply a "presence." Here, for instance, is an acknowledgment from Admiral J. Watkins, former U.S. Navy chief of staff: "Even in peacetime our strategy envisages the demonstration of force using ships and aircraft. From 1946 to 1982 U.S. Armed Forces were used on 250 occasions abroad, and the Navy played the most important role in 80 percent of these actions." I will add to Watkins' words that even very recently the United States has by no means abandoned military escapades in various regions of the world. Military forces continue to be accumulated. Even so there is still talk of the "Soviet military threat." It is easy to find "sensational" reports in U.S. newspapers about a "buildup in the might and in the permanent presence of Soviet ship groupings in many regions of the world's oceans" and "revelations" about our missiles and tanks in Europe.

The truth is that in the sphere of naval and all other armaments the USSR is doing nothing apart from what is determined by its defense requirements. Soviet military doctrine—and the whole world is aware of this—was and remains strictly defensive. We do not threaten anyone. But, of course, we show the utmost concern for our country's security although this also demands great forces and funds.

I can say on behalf of all Army and Navy servicemen that we are delighted with the positive changes in the international situation which have emerged recently, and primarily the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

[Mysyakov] The recent incident in the Black Sea forces us to involuntarily doubt the sincerity of the U.S. intentions. Incidentally, many KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA readers are asking whether our attitude to those who violate our maritime borders is too tolerant.

[Chernavin] The two U.S. Navy ships' premeditated move into our territorial waters cannot be called anything other than an impudent trick. Especially since this is not the first such incident. A similar incident occurred near our Black Sea shores in spring 1986. Following this, indignant letters began to arrive at the Navy General Staff: Why did you not take the appropriate steps and why did you not sink the impudent violators? We answered that the decision was dictated by the desire to avoid conflict and to demonstrate our peaceableness and goodwill. So this time we also showed restraint and did not give in to the flagrant provocation. Our vessels dislodged the uninvited "guests" beyond the limits of USSR territorial waters. Soviet seamen acted boldly, efficiently, skillfully, and, I would say, masterfully.

[Mysyakov] Vladimir Nikolayevich, recently I had occasion to visit a large ASW ship. I will be honest: I was surprised by the conditions in which seamen live. Narrow passageways in the crew's quarters, 3-bunk berths, and a crowded kitchen. True, none of the crew ever complained about this in conversations with the correspondent. Why do you think this is true?

[Chernavin] The life of a seaman is really rigorous. The lion's share of the ship's space is "eaten up" by combat equipment. But what you saw was even recently thought of almost as a fairytale. I remember very well when submariners had to wash and even clean their teeth with outboard salt water. Not a lot of fun, believe me. The salt eats away at the skin, and it cracks. The cramped conditions on surface ships were such that the present crew's quarters would have seem like palaces then. Now all ships and nuclear-powered submarines are fitted with distillation units, which provide the requisite quantity of fresh water. Special instruments monitor the purity of the air in the work areas and cabins. There are minute saunas on some ships and even submarines. If we are talking about the Navy's problems today, then we must not start with living conditions. Naval service is associated above all with psychological difficulties.

Just imagine. A ship goes to sea with long months of navigation ahead. The word "navigation," however, is not quite suitable for defining what seamen do. Combat work goes on constantly day in day out, week in week out. Watch—short rest—again watch. Living space is limited. The monotony and uniformity are tiring. Hearts long for home, relatives, and loved ones. Yet very high vigilance and complete mobilization of forces—spiritual and physical—are required of a seaman.

[Mysyakov] The Navy is comprised not only of ships and submarines. Naval uniforms are also worn by those who serve on land—at bases, in headquarters... "Shipboard" officers talked to me sadly about the fact that service is easier for the "landlubbers" and—this is what is shameful—life in general is better. They were talking about distribution of housing, travel vouchers, places in creches and kindergartens, and service promotion. Are the complaints justified?

[Chernavin] They are to a large extent justified. An alarming trend emerged at one point: Reports began to come from young officers requesting a transfer from ship to shore. What we call social justice was violated. Now the situation is gradually being rectified. A competent commission is working and is examining proposals submitted in the course of a general Navy discussion on the prestige of shipboard personnel. A special directive exists on this subject. It provides for a whole series of privileges for ships' officers and their families.

[Mysyakov] Vladimir Nikolayevich, seamen and inducted petty officers form the majority of Navy personnel. Let us be frank: You will rarely hear a draftee

request a military commissariat to send him into the Navy. Yet there are many examples of the reverse. Does this alarm you, as commander in chief?

[Chernavin] Of course it alarms me. The main reason for this is, I think, the length of service. In other branches of the Armed Forces it is 2 years, but in the Navy it is 3 years. This is not someone's whim. The period of service in the Navy is determined by its special conditions—above all by the complexity of the equipment used. What way out can I see? Only one: Serious thought must be given to real benefits for seamen.

[Mysyakov] A process of restructuring is under way in the Navy, as throughout the country. Please tell me about its main avenues.

[Chernavin] I would first of all like to specify what restructuring constitutes. Some people understand it in a simplistic way: Everything that existed before is bad and everything that is being done now is good. Our renowned sportsman and writer Yuriy Vlasov once said that he was alarmed by "mass enlightenment [prozreniye]." This also alarms me. The essence of restructuring consists, in my opinion, not in rejecting the past. Certainly, there were miscalculations, major ones at times. But there were also successes. Today we must attentively investigate the mistakes made and seek ways to very speedily rectify them.

If we are talking specifically about the Navy, then it must be admitted that there are still navigational accidents, collisions between ships, violations of military discipline, and other negative phenomena. We make no secret of this.

But on the whole our problems are the same as everyone else's. The inexhaustible flood of all sorts of paper impedes normal service. We are trying to reduce this. Things have become a little better now but the pressure of the paper "press" can still be felt. Moreover, we have reduced the central managerial apparatus—very substantially. The same thing is now happening in naval staff establishments.

The process of democratization is gathering pace, but not without complexities. The Army and Navy are based on the principle of one-man command. We cannot avoid this—under combat conditions there would naturally be no time for meetings and voting. But one-man command per se by no means means arbitrariness by the commanders invested with power.

[Mysyakov] Thank you for the interview, Vladimir Nikolayevich. Admittedly it has not proved very festive....

[Chernavin] It is always more pleasant to talk about victories and achievements, but that is not all there is in life. Such is life.

Defense Ministry Releases Navy Documentary
LD231953 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1040 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Documentary entitled "Sea Shield of the Motherland: Film Studio of the USSR Ministry of Defense, 1987" by unidentified narrator—recorded]

[Text] [Narrator] Every morning in every fleet of the Soviet Union begins with the flag raising. Within this tradition, sacred for naval sailors, is a tribute in memory and respect of the fleet's glorious history, pride in one's fatherland, and an oath of fidelity to the motherland.

One can now see the Soviet naval flag in the Atlantic and the Pacific, in the tropical latitudes of the Indian Ocean, and among the Arctic ice. The foundations of the might of the naval fleet are made up of warships which incorporate the achievements of Soviet science and the engineering thought and skills of shipbuilders.

The main school of professional training for sailors is the sea, the ocean. It is only in the conditions of hard, long voyages that naval skills are grasped, will and character are tempered, and the ability to fight a strong and well armed enemy is acquired.

The military-strategic situation in the world's seas has in recent years become increasingly tense. The Soviet Union cannot fail to take into account that through the efforts of the United States and NATO, the world's seas have been turned into an arena for unleashing aggression against the USSR and other socialist countries. [video shows line of KA-27 helicopters ready for takeoff on flight deck, with U.S. helicopter visible in distance]

Preventing the realization of the aggressive plans is a most important patriotic and internationalist duty of the Navy. [video shows U.S. destroyer and other small warships flying U.S. flag at sea and fighter flying over sea]

U.S. presidents talk one after the other about the wrongfulness of the USSR having an oceangoing navy. They would like to close off altogether the Soviet Union's access to the ocean. U.S. Navy Secretary Lehman has expressed it thus: We must turn the Soviets into an isolated island, so we dominate the world. To this end the United States must possess an undisputed advantage on the seas and have the capability to block the Russian fleet in USSR territorial waters. [video shows various shots of Yankee class missile submarine on surface offshore; (?destroyer) hull number 621 at sea, and two other warships]

The creation of a Soviet oceangoing nuclear missile fleet capable of carrying out tactical, operational, and strategic tasks in any part of the world's seas did a great deal to sober up the imperialist aggressors, and dispersed their hopes that they would not have a strong opponent in the sphere of armed struggle at sea. As long as there is no

alternative, immense squadrons, chock full of bombs, missiles, and aircraft will continue to plough the ocean. For that reason, the responsibility for every press of the button, every turn of the wheel in every combat post rises immeasurably. In such a situation, being ever ready to prevent even the slightest accident due to which the automatic chain of nuclear war might be put into action in a moment becomes the main thing. [video shows view from cockpit of three TU-16's in flight, accompanied by several other aircraft including (?Swedish) fighter, F-15, and Lightning]

Day and night, in any weather, awesome winged machines head for the sea; they go on patrols of many hours duration, to full range, as they say. Often such flights are accompanied by foreign fighters, since the ocean of the air, like neutral waters, is open to all. Sometimes they have to do their combat watch in conditions where the probable enemy is, as it were, trying their patience, as if waiting for their nerve to give out. A constant duel continues—a silent, but meaningful demonstrative stand-off from each other. This goes under the name of the deterrence strategy, the same axis on which military equilibrium is dangerously held, peace on earth is maintained. So far, this is the only way. [video shows aerial view of three warships, then jets taking off from U.S. aircraft carrier: Yankee class missile submarine from the air, submerging]

Our country is a peace-loving state. In recent years it has come out with a number of important initiatives to reduce confrontation at sea. Among them is the proposal to restrict the limits for patrol by submarines carrying nuclear missiles, one on the total demilitarization of the Indian Ocean zone, on withdrawal of vessels carrying nuclear weapons from the Mediterranean, and on reducing the level of military confrontation in the north. But so far these proposals have not found a response from the United States. In these conditions, our state has been compelled to constantly improve its naval fleet. The foundation of the combat potential of the Soviet Navy is the atomic missile-carrying submarines, carrying strategic ICBM's. All the very latest modern achievements in the sphere of world shipbuilding and nuclear weaponry are concentrated in the submarine missile carriers, which have virtually unlimited range and self-sufficiency at sea, great depths of submersion and traveling speed. They possess great strike force, a high level of combat endurance, and are capable of carrying out combat operations on a global scale. The Soviet submarine forces are a system of weapons that is constantly being improved, which apart from the missile submarines includes submarines armed with cruise missiles and long-range self-targeting torpedoes. Multipurpose submarines not only carry tactical weapons, but also form an integral part of the strategic nuclear shield of our motherland. [video shows (?TU-95) taking off, then two TU-16 jets taking off and view from cockpit of two other TU-16's in flight]

Maritime aviation, through the importance of the tasks which it resolves, has now come to occupy a leading place amongst the USSR's naval forces. It includes

long-range jet aircraft, armed with missiles with conventional and nuclear warheads. The increased strike power, the significant operational range, the high level of flight readiness, and the level of equipment with modern radio electronics—all this provides maritime aviation with the possibility of resolving a wide range of tasks, independently or in cooperation with other naval forces. [video shows aerial view from various angles of the "Novorossiysk" with unidentified aircraft on flight deck; several YAK-38's on deck]

A new generation of aircraft carrying cruisers is the next stage of development of maritime aviation. For vessels of this type, aircraft with vertical and short take-off and landing were specially developed. Modern aircraft carrying cruisers have become a frightening means of battle which successfully combine two environments—sea and air, combining the qualities of a ship and a floating airfield. The building of aircraft carrying cruisers has signified a qualitative leap in surface ship development. Such ships, having on board powerful weaponry for defense and attack, aircraft and helicopters, and modern radio electronic apparatus, have considerably enhanced the combat might of our navy. Now that aircraft carrying cruisers have come into service, the USSR Navy has for the first time gained the opportunity to have its own aviation in ship's formations. [video shows aerial views of (?cruiser) with hull number 028; KA-25 and KA-27 helicopters taking off from afterdeck; helicopter lowering something into water; BE-12 Chayka aircraft patrolling; sonar equipment being operated; helicopter approaching landing pad, battery of missiles being launched, guns firing and torpedoes being launched from tubes]

One of the main tasks resolved by surface ships is to seek and destroy submarines. The rapid development of science and technology in the last decade has opened up fresh opportunities in the surface ship's struggle against its ancient, invisible enemy, the submarine. It is difficult to say which will gain the greater potential in the foreseeable future, and only one thing is clear: It is no easy job for a ship alone to seek out a submarine in the ocean. To combat the underwater enemy, a special group of different kind of antisubmarine forces is usually formed, including surface ships, antisubmarine aviation, and multipurpose submarines. Ship based helicopters considerably expand the search capabilities of a ship, and provide a high degree of reliability in contacts made with underwater targets. In joint search, wide use is made of antisubmarine aircraft. Equipped with search apparatus and a system for receiving information from other forces, aircraft can carry out the search in distant areas, operating without the submarines' knowledge. The search for a submarine is a complex process, requiring precise organization and coordination of all forces taking part in it. Guidance for the submarine search is implemented from the ship's combat operations center. It is here that all information comes together, and here that it is processed using special computing systems. Also here, the commands for use of weapons are produced. [video shows stern of cruiser "Frunze"; two other warships at a

distance; and missile being launched from TU-16] The Navy has gained a reputation as a force capable of effectively influencing the situation in littoral areas of combat operations, and of considerably easing conditions for ground forces in carrying out their operational and strategic tasks. The Marines are one of the most mobile forces of the Navy. Possessing landing craft of various classes, amphibious tanks, armored transport vehicles and other equipment, and with support from the sea and the air, the Marines are able in a short time to inflict sudden blows on territory seized by an enemy, and to steadfastly defend their shore.

However up-to-date the combat technology and weapons may be, the decisive role in the Navy's combat readiness has always belonged and will belong to people. One grows up early at sea. It is these 18-20-year-old lads who have taken on the weight of responsibility for the security of their motherland. Service at sea is difficult. Not everyone can cope with long voyages far from the native shores, many months of separation from those who are near and dear, storms and icing up of ships. The exhausting watches, following one after another in a long series, are not easy. But the person who overcomes this already feels he is a different man: strong, tempered, courageous.

We have become accustomed to talking about ships and thinking about their power, their weaponry and other technical facilities, sometimes forgetting that it is people who serve on ships. Here they think about the difficulties and dangers of which service is so full as the last thing, even though it is not difficult to imagine that only tens of centimeters from this compartment, flooded in bright light, are thousands of miles of ocean. Our sailors carry out their service in distant ocean expanses, eye to eye with the raging elements. The sea is a strict examiner; it never forgives carelessness, cheating, or untidiness. Training at sea is the same as in combat; the water temperature outside the ship is degrees. One for all and all for one—the iron law of fraternity at sea. It acquires profound, specific sense right here, where not only the life of the whole crew, but also the honor and dignity of our motherland, peace and calm on earth, depend on the actions of every mate, warrant officer, and officer. [video shows sailors watching television, full frame video from the news program they are watching, with Gorbachev talking to sailors on deck of submarine and to men on cruiser "Kirov"]

Wherever our ships may be located in the world's seas, the profound spiritual unity between naval sailors and the motherland, the people, is not weakened for a moment. [video shows Gorbachev on submarine deck talking to sailors]

Today Mikhail Sergeyevich inspected the ships of the Red Banner Northern Fleet. He got to know the naval sailors, the descendants of those who in the years of war made our arms glorious in the Polar region.

[Gorbachev] Hello, comrades, men of Severomorsk! How is the mood of the sailors?

[Sailor] Thank you for your concern about the fleet, your attention to it. We will not let you down.

[Gorbachev] Well, what can one say, mighty power, immense capabilities; but it is all in the hands of men. It becomes a hundred, thousand, something like a million times stronger through this, having the mastery of it all.

[Gorbachev] Here's something you should know: (?You make an immense) contribution to all of the plans we have mapped out and are implementing. Defense has to be strong, and all of our plans are reliably defended. Such a force as our navy is a concentration of immense defensive might, it is a reliable shield.

[Narrator] The Soviet people is a peaceful people. But it is only politicians who are short-sighted or who simply do not wish to sort out the existing state of affairs and balance of forces who might hope that their aggressive actions will remain without response. In a complicated international situation, Soviet naval sailors are carrying out a responsible and noble task—the defense of their fatherland. The feeling that one is on the front, a high sense of responsibility for the security of our motherland for peace on earth does not leave Soviet sailors for a minute. In their hands is our future, our hopes that every morning will be a peaceful one.

Gareyev Addresses Briefing on Doctrine

PM240935 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
23 Feb 88 Single Edition p 4

[Lieutenant Colonel V. Nikanorov report: "From Positions of the New Thinking"]

[Text] "New Political Thinking and Soviet Military Doctrine." A briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists on this topic has been held at NOVOSTI. Representatives of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate participated in it.

The briefing participants' statements and the replies to journalists' questions emphasized that the nuclear danger threatens everyone today. Survival in the nuclear and space age transcends all contradictions and disagreements and is becoming the chief task for all mankind. Therefore, a resolute switch to positions of the new political thinking is more important in the military sphere than anywhere else. It is necessary to finally reject obsolete views on problems of national and international security and stop gambling on the "nuclear deterrence" on which NATO policy is built today.

Replying to a question from KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's correspondent, Colonel General M.A. Gareyev, deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, emphasized that at the present stage in the development of

Soviet military doctrine it remains an unshakable fact that this doctrine stems from the peace-loving policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state. The contemporary military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact states constitutes a system of officially accepted basic views on the prevention of war, military building, the preparation of their countries and armed forces to repulse aggression, and the means of waging armed struggle to defend socialism.

What is new here is the fact that, whereas military doctrine used to be defined as a system of views on the preparation for war and the waging of war, its substance is now based on the prevention of war. The task of preventing war is becoming the supreme goal, the nucleus of military doctrine, the basic function of the state and the armed forces. Of course, a world war must be prevented chiefly by political means, but this must also be reflected in defensive activity.

The chief essence of the political aspect of our military doctrine is that socialism unconditionally rejects war as a means of resolving interstate political, economic, and ideological differences. The socialist countries do not treat any state or any people whatsoever as their enemy, do not make territorial claims against any state, and, from the viewpoint of internal conditions, do not need an army.

A very important feature of the Warsaw Pact states' military doctrine, Col Gen M.A. Gareyev pointed out, is that it has a strictly defensive thrust. The fraternal states confirm that they will not under any circumstances begin a war—either nuclear or conventional—against any state, whether in Europe or in another part of the world, if they themselves do not become the target of an attack.

The attainment of the lowest level of confrontation between the sides would accord with the Warsaw Pact states' interests. True equal security in our age is guaranteed not by a high level but by the lowest possible level of strategic balance. But since the level of these limits is imposed by the imperialist states' war preparations, the socialist countries' defense might must be built with due regard to the fact that security, if we speak of Soviet-U.S. relations, can only be mutual or, if we take international relations as a whole, only universal.

Other journalists' questions were also answered.

Discusses Arctic, Vietnam

LD221606 Moscow TASS in English 1547 GMT
22 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 22 TASS—"The process of Perestroika, widening of democracy and Glasnost, taking place in our country is conducted in the armed forces, too," said deputy chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces Colonel General Mahkmut Gareyev. He spoke today at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists at the press centre of the Novosti press agency.

"This is confirmed by the facts of visits of foreign specialists to our nuclear range in Semipalatinsk, to the radar station in Krasnoyarsk and other military facilities", he said, answering questions from newsmen. "We are for broad international control over the reduction of different kinds of armaments".

Dwelling on the difference of the military doctrines of the West and socialist countries, Mahkmut Gareyev said that "statements of the West on the defensive character of their military doctrines must be borne up by deeds or at least by official obligations. The West now refuses to conclude a non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization, rejects the proposal to disband the military blocs, does not even agree to officially proclaim the obligation to refrain from the first use of nuclear weapons, the way it has been done by the Warsaw Treaty countries. The western countries continue upholding the concept of nuclear deterrence and intend to 'compensate' in some way for the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. All this gives rise to certain doubts about the defensive nature of the military doctrine of the North Atlantic alliance", he said.

"The Soviet Union stated that it does not exclude from the discussion any types of arms and any areas, including the area of the Barents Sea", said spokesman of the general staff Oleg Lisov in answer to the question on problems of military activity in the Arctic areas. He emphasized that the Soviet Union had already removed a radar station from the Kola peninsula, taken out a part of troops, but its proposals had not evoked response in the West. "It is hoped in the Soviet Union that the Canadian administration will approach the idea of the deployment of atomic submarines from the positions of new thinking and will reject that idea", he said.

The Soviet Union does not have a military base in the Vietnam's Camranh Bay, the spokesman for the general staff said. "On agreement with the Vietnamese Government, Soviet vessels are rendered technical maintenance there. The West's 'concern' over this matter looks hypocritical against the background of its complete indifference to the fact that the United States has a thousand bases situated around the Soviet Union and other socialist countries".

Further on Briefing

LD231601 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1330 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] A briefing on the theme, The New Political Mentality and the Soviet Military Doctrine, has been held for Soviet and foreign journalists in the USSR Foreign Ministry press center. Our correspondent, Irina Mishina, was present at it:

[Mishina] Just now, as we look back, we in a sense interpret afresh the path traversed by our army and Lenin's behests on the defense of the socialist homeland. It is these that lie at the heart of the Soviet military

doctrine. As was noted today at the briefing, our military doctrine has been subjected to various interpretations in the years of Soviet power. Nevertheless, the main aspect, the defensive nature, has remained unchanged. What is the basis of it today? Here is how Colonel General Gareyev, deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, answered this question:

[Begin recording] Above all, the main thing in our military doctrine today is to avert war, and at the same time, of course, to be ready to ensure the reliable defense of the socialist states. Averting war is the main goal and the main element of the military doctrine, and we work on the basis that, although there exists a threat of war, there is no fatal inevitability of war. That war can be averted. [end recording]

[Mishina] Another totally new aspect on which attention was focused at the briefing: For the first time in history, the issue has been raised of averting war by means of military measures. This includes a verification system and on-site inspections the exchange of military information and military experts. A recent example of this was the exchange of Soviet and U.S. military observers at the Semipalatinsk and Nevada testing ranges. In short, the new political mentality is having an ever greater effect on the military doctrine of our country. Let us just recall: It was the Soviet Union that put forward the program for the staged scrapping of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. As was noted at today's briefing, however, nuclear disarmament cannot be a unilateral process. Unfortunately, not always do the socialist countries meet with understanding and reciprocity on the part of NATO member countries. Colonel General Gareyev pointed to the example of the danger of the U.S. plans to compensate for the U.S. intermediate- and shorter-range missiles scrapped under the treaty by creating other nuclear forces in Europe. Replying to a question on the responsibility of the Soviet and U.S. sides in the matter of nuclear disarmament, he said in part:

[Begin recording] Now we are obliged to take heed of the realities of the nuclear age, and we must do so. We say that, in our times, given the existence of nuclear weapons and indeed, given the perfection of conventional types of armaments, in general war must not be permitted. You know that Mr Shulz, the U.S. secretary of state has been here. The Soviet Union is full of determination to do everything that was agreed upon in Washington. We will hope for success in this, but it does not depend solely on us. [end recording]

Civil Defense Chief on Tasks, Priorities

PM240955 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
21 Feb 88 p 2

[Article by Colonel General V.P. Novikov, USSR Civil Defense deputy chief for political affairs: "Guarding the Gains of Great October"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Contemporary warfare makes qualitatively new demands on the country's rear services and their capability to provide the Armed

Forces with everything needed to successfully conduct combat operations. The course and the outcome of a war depend to a tremendous degree precisely on the state of the country's economy, the degree of success achieved in preserving production in the event of enemy nuclear strikes and then restoring whatever part of it has been destroyed, and the extent of population losses.

Particular topicality in peacetime is attached to work on the speediest elimination of the consequences of natural disasters and production accidents and work to protect people in these conditions, as happened at the Chernobyl AES. Civil defense is assigned an important role in resolving these defense tasks. It is of a nationwide character in our country. The strengthening and improvement of civil defense is a vital matter for all working people in cities and rural areas. Protecting the

population is the cornerstone of all civil defense measures and its profound purpose, for the security of Soviet people and their right to life was and will be the prime concern of the Communist Party and the Soviet state.

Recently increasing attention in the country has been devoted to increasing the reliability of the population's defense, making the economy function more stably, and improving the quality of civil defense instruction for the personnel of nonmilitarized units and the entire population. There are many such examples both in kolkhozes and sovkhozes. A great deal still remains to be done, however. Questions of protecting agricultural livestock, crops, raw materials, and finished output from potential negative influences need further study and great attention. In short, civil defense fighters are endeavoring to act so that Soviet people are always confident that in both peacetime and in wartime civil defense is always ready to come to their aid. [passage omitted]